

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|---|
| 2103 | 1 | <p>Not only will you destroy the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta by allowing even more salt water to infiltrate our waterways, [you] will also impact our area's wells and irrigation systems.</p> <p>The tunnels we already have and all the water that has been sent through them to date has done untold damage to our farmland and wells. They already are contaminated with salt infiltration.</p> | <p>The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).</p> |
| 2103 | 2 | <p>Farms in this area contribute \$2 billion to California's economy and those are the farmers who keep your food source readily available and reasonably priced. Just think about paying \$10.00 for a gallon of milk or \$4.00 for a single apple. Don't cut your own throats.</p> | <p>As described in Impact ECON-6 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of conveyance facilities would convert land from existing agricultural uses to project-related construction uses, and agricultural land could also be affected by changes in water quality and other conditions that would affect crop productivity. These direct effects on agricultural land are described under Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Total value of irrigated crop production in the Delta would decline on average by \$5.3 million per year during the construction period, with total irrigated crop acreage declining by about 4,700 acres. Other effects related to production costs, travel time, and loss of investments in production facilities and standing orchards and vineyards would also occur as a result of facilities construction. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. As described in Section 14.1.1.4 of Chapter 14, Agriculture, the study area contains 585,000 acres of agricultural land; 4,700 acres would be less than 1% of that land so it is unlikely that prices would increase at such a drastic rate. Additionally, food costs are not a CEQA or NEPA issue so they are not analyzed in this report.</p> |
| 2103 | 3 | <p>It is now time for Southern California and all its big money to build [its] own water source. Southern California gets much more rain than we do but what are they doing to capture it? Nothing. Build some dams and fill them. You've got an ocean to draw from -- build a few desalination plants now, not later.</p> | <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.</p> |
| 2104 | 1 | <p>I am very strongly opposed to spending taxpayer billions of dollars on building the twin tunnels when this expenditure will consume a high proportion of the state's financial resources without increasing capacity in any way.</p> | <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, turbidity, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Responses 5.</p> |
| 2104 | 2 | <p>As the snowpack continues to subside in the next decade the vast majority of our funding should be spent now on additional storage capacity that will be coming online over the next ten and twenty years.</p> | <p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p> |
| 2104 | 3 | <p>I guarantee you that if the State of California spends twenty billion dollars on twin tunnels, when the snow pack disappears and there has been no development of storage</p> | <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | <p>capacity and taxpayers will still be paying for the twin tunnels to nowhere, they will not support the funding needed for new water storage.</p> <p>The agricultural corporations will not survive the dry years and with the time it takes to build dams, with the success of dam funding dependent entirely on an increasingly unpredictable climate, the Central Valley will be the next Dust Bowl.</p> <p>Recalculate the path forward after this year's 2015/2016 rain. With record-breaking rain during very short periods of time, survival 2050 will be a different game plan.</p> | <p>Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p> |
| 2105 | 1 | <p>The California WaterFix is subtitled "reliable clean water." But less "reliable clean water" would flow through the Delta and the San Francisco Bay than ever before if the Governor's Delta tunnels are built. I urge that the Delta tunnels project be abandoned. Taking water away from the largest estuary on the Pacific coast of both American continents would lead to a catastrophic change to that ecosystem's sustainability. Diverting water from one part of California to benefit another is not a statewide solution to providing "reliable clean water" to all Californians.</p> | <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</p> |
| 2105 | 2 | <p>As a resident of San Francisco, I urge you to protect the entire San Francisco Bay watershed and preserve clean, fresh water for drinking, recreation, fishing, industry, and agriculture. Both habitat and endangered species would be affected adversely if the Delta tunnels are built. Without increased, not decreased, freshwater flows, the San Francisco Bay Delta ecosystem will continue to degrade.</p> | <p>The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant aquatic and terrestrial resource impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> |
| 2105 | 3 | <p>For millions of years the water from the Sacramento River flowed through the Delta and the Bay out to nourish the ocean. This ecosystem was quickly degraded because of large-scale water diversions as early as 1933 when the Central Valley Project began. It was further degraded by even more water diversions with the building of the California State Water Project in 1963. These projects put many iconic species on the endangered list and more are being added to the "watch" list each year. The Delta tunnels would have the capacity to capture up to 100% of the average flow of the Sacramento River above the Delta and divert this water southward to the state and federal aqueducts. If even greater amounts of water are diverted, as planned, those species already on the brink of collapse will collapse. Letting this happen would violate the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and trust obligations to Native Americans.</p> | <p>Operation of the project water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS.</p> |
| 2105 | 4 | <p>Clearly California has a serious water issue, but building an exorbitantly expensive, one-size-fits-all project will not solve the state's water supply problem. Our water supply issues should be solved locally, just as many international water experts have suggested. Moreover, this state imposed solution, which all Californians would have to pay for but not benefit from, would cause divisiveness between water districts, towns and cities. Funds currently allocated to build the tunnels should be used instead to repair existing leaky water delivery systems and promote lower water use. This part of the WaterFix I can support. We Californians have reduced our water use by about 33% just this year. There is more we can do without adding new, expensive infrastructure. Please, do not OK the building of one of the most expensive projects in California's history. There are far better and less costly solutions to providing a reliable water supply to all Californians.</p> | <p>Future water demands under the SWP and CVP water contract municipal uses are consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent per capita urban water use by 2020. The BDCP is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta. It is consistent with other programs to provide continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation as well as other water supplies (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p> <p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | Please, do not support the Delta tunnels. | Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. |
| 2106 | 1 | This most important and this absolute devastating statewide disaster [is] being proposed for reasons other than good government, good public policy and most certainly not to the benefit of all, but just a few! | DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 regarding the proposed project's Purpose and Need. More information on the project's purpose and need can also be found in Chapter 2 of the Final EIR/EIS. |
| 2106 | 2 | The Greater Stockton Chamber of Commerce has been a force in Stockton, San Joaquin County and the Central Valley since 1901 and has been at the forefront of many issues, good and bad for all, and this proposal of the "Legacy Tunnels" ranks up there as one of the worst ideas ever presented by anyone in the State's history. The Greater Stockton Chamber of Commerce represents not only our actual paid membership of over 1000 businesses of all sizes but also the entire business community, their employees and families (who are all voters also), and strongly opposes the so called "WaterFix!" | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. See response to comment 2106-1 regarding the Purpose and Need of the proposed project. |
| 2106 | 3 | <p>The Greater Stockton Chamber of Commerce staff and membership work to aggressively develop and promote an economically vibrant business community in San Joaquin County. San Joaquin County is one of the five Delta counties and geographically contains 40% of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, the interior of the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary. This area of the Delta falls into what was defined under the Delta Protection Act as the Primary Zone of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and is made up mostly of prime farmland, as defined by the California Department of Agriculture. Moreover, approximately 50% of the 62.1 square miles of the City of Stockton falls in the Secondary Zone of the Delta, defined as the surrounding urban periphery of the interior Delta. [Footnote 1: http://www.delta.ca.gov/res/docs/Delta%20Map%20Exhibit.pdf</p> <p>http://www.delta.ca.gov/res/docs/ESP/ESP_P2_FINAL.pdf Geographical and economic data provided by Delta Protection Commission.]</p> <p>According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the Stockton metropolitan area gross domestic product at year-end 2012 was \$385 million. [Footnote 2: https://www.quandl.com/data/BEA/GMP44700_GDP_INFORMATION_STOCKTONCA-GDP-Information-Stockton-CA] The San Joaquin County Annual Crop report for 2013 indicates that farm revenues for that same period were over \$2,893,000,000. [Footnote 3: http://www.sjgov.org/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=17738. 2013 Annual Agricultural Report, San Joaquin County. Page 2.] Furthermore, the Delta Protection Commission's Economic Sustainability Report documents the value of the Delta regional agricultural economy at \$5.2 billion annually [and] Delta recreation at \$750,000,000 annually, industries found within the 40% geographical sector in San Joaquin County. This report also indicates there are three critical clusters for the Delta economy in both the Primary and Secondary Zones of the Delta: agriculture; transportation; warehousing and utilities; construction, housing, and real estate. [Footnote 4: http://www.delta.ca.gov/res/docs/ESP/ESP_P2_FINAL.pdf. Economic Sustainability Plan for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Page 34.]</p> <p>The Stockton and San Joaquin County economies and gross domestic products are tied directly to water dependent industries such as agriculture and recreation. Furthermore, significant sectors of the Stockton transportation and warehousing industries are tied to</p> | <p>Please see Chapter 16 of the Final EIR/EIS regarding socioeconomic impacts, Chapter 14 regarding agricultural impacts and Chapter 15 regarding recreational impacts.</p> <p>More information on agricultural impact mitigation can be found in Master Response 18. For information on water quality please see Master Response 14 and Chapter 8 of the Final EIR/EIS. Please also see response to comment 2106-1 regarding the project's purpose and need.</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | the distribution, packing, and processing of agricultural products. Within Stockton, urban industries including recreation, retail, construction, housing and real estate are not only tied directly to Delta agricultural production within San Joaquin County, but are also dependent directly on Delta water quality and quantity for present revenues and projected future business growth. | |
| 2106 | 4 | The Greater Stockton Chamber of Commerce objects to the adverse economic impacts that would/will occur under the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)/California WaterFix/Water Tunnels project (Water Tunnels project). Under the BDCP, three large new intakes would divert vast amounts of water from the Sacramento River between Clarksburg and Courtland through two tunnels roughly 35 miles south for export from the Central Valley and State Water Projects' pumping plants. As a result of this massive new diversion ("Water Tunnels project"), enormous quantities of freshwater which now flow through the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta before being diverted would never even reach the Delta. Furthermore, a number of the 56 significant and adverse impacts would be experienced by San Joaquin County businesses during the 14-year construction period, causing a ripple effect on the area economy. | <p>The proposed project aims to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same to the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>Implementing a dual conveyance system, in which water could be diverted from either the north or the south or both, depending on the needs of aquatic organisms, would align water operations to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with state-of-the-art fish screens. With this future vision in mind, DWR, in coordination with Reclamation, proposed a strategy for restoring ecological functions in the Delta while improving water supply reliability in California.</p> <p>Please also see response to comment 2106-1 regarding the project's purpose and need.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 10 regarding significant and unavoidable impacts. Please see Chapter 16 of the Final EIR/EIS regarding socioeconomics. For information on water rights and area of origin please see Master Response 32 and Master Response 26, respectively.</p> |
| 2106 | 5 | <p>The BDCP Delta Water Tunnels plan RDEIR/RDEIS does not contain a description of adequate compensation for the five Delta counties, Delta cities and towns, and dozens of reclamation districts to offset the property tax and revenue declines resulting from construction and operation of the project. Without adequate analysis for full economic mitigation for the greater Stockton area and San Joaquin County, the plan fails to protect the Delta as placed under the Delta Reform Act. [Footnote 5: Water Code 12220 defines the Delta as place as part of the 2009 Delta Reform Act.</p> <p>Http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=WAT&division=6.&title=&part=4.5.&chapter=2.&article]</p> | <p>Chapter 16 of the Final EIR/EIS states that the Delta is located within portions of Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo counties and includes portions or all of the cities of Sacramento, Isleton, Elk Grove, West Sacramento, Rio Vista, Pittsburg, Antioch, Oakley, Brentwood, Stockton, Lathrop, Manteca, Tracy, and Lodi. This chapter describes socioeconomics effects in the Delta region. The study area for the socioeconomics analysis comprises Sacramento, San Joaquin, Yolo, Solano, and Contra Costa Counties, collectively referred to as the Delta region. The discussion of the Delta region describes the existing socioeconomic conditions of the statutory Delta and the surrounding Delta counties.</p> <p>Under Alternative 4A, publicly-owned water conveyance facilities would be constructed on land of which some is currently held by private owners. Property tax and assessment revenue generated by lands that would be transferred from private to is estimated to total \$6.7 million over the construction period. Typically, decreases in revenue could potentially result in the loss of a substantial share of some agencies' tax bases and particularly for smaller districts affected by a project. However, California Water Code (Section 85089 subdivision 9b) specifies that the entities constructing and operating a new Delta conveyance facility will fully mitigate for the loss of property tax revenues or assessments levied by local governments or special districts. This Water Code requirement will ensure that tax revenues forgone as a result of transferring land from private to public ownership will be fully offset. Please also see response to comment 2106-6.</p> <p>See Master Response 31 regarding the Delta Reform Act. For a discussion on mitigation please see Master Response 22.</p> |
| 2106 | 6 | <p>Neither the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, Chapter 8 of the draft EIR/S of the BDCP, nor the draft REIR/S of California WaterFix contain a discussion of economic mitigation for the Primary or Secondary Zones of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.</p> <p>The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta supports a \$5.2 billion annual agricultural industry, and 40 percent of those farms are in San Joaquin County. These farms are diversified,</p> | <p>Please see response to comment 2106-5.</p> <p>As described in Impact ECON-6 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the Final EIR/EIS, construction of conveyance facilities would convert land from existing agricultural uses to project-related construction uses, and agricultural land could also be affected by changes in water quality and other conditions that would affect crop productivity. These direct effects on agricultural land are described under</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | <p>sustainable, family farms dating back six generations, and the economic contributions from these families to our local economy are significant. Delivering fresh food to San Francisco and beyond is why Stockton originally developed a port. The Port of Stockton is California's third largest port and in 2012 supported 4,500 jobs and \$4.9 million in local tax funds. [Footnote 6: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Port_of_Stockton]</p> <p>Delta farmers buy farming machinery, trucking services, seed, fuel, pumps, hardware, fertilizer, and insurance. Their profits are spent at local restaurants, retail outlets, and entertainment venues. Many of their children and grandchildren buy homes locally. They bank locally. And they make significant contributions to local charities that support a broad spectrum of causes that make our community better.</p> | <p>Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Total value of irrigated crop production in the Delta would decline on average by \$5.3 million per year during the construction period, with total irrigated crop acreage declining by about 4,700 acres. Other effects related to production costs, travel time, and loss of investments in production facilities and standing orchards and vineyards would also occur as a result of facilities construction. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. While the compensation to property owners would reduce the severity of economic effects related to the loss of agricultural land, it would not constitute mitigation for any related physical impact.</p> <p>As mentioned above, under Alternative 4A, publicly-owned water conveyance facilities would be constructed on land of which some is currently held by private owners. Property tax and assessment revenue generated by lands that would be transferred from private to is estimated to total \$6.7 million over the construction period. Typically, decreases in revenue could potentially result in the loss of a substantial share of some agencies' tax bases and particularly for smaller districts affected by a project. However, California Water Code (Section 85089 subdivision 9b) specifies that the entities constructing and operating a new Delta conveyance facility will fully mitigate for the loss of property tax revenues or assessments levied by local governments or special districts. This Water Code requirement will ensure that tax revenues forgone as a result of transferring land from private to public ownership will be fully offset.</p> <p>As discussed under Impact ECON-1, construction of the water conveyance facilities would be anticipated to result in a net temporary increase of income and employment in the Delta region. Construction-related employment from the project is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Throughout the five-county Delta region, population and employment would expand as a result of the construction of water conveyance facilities, as discussed under Impacts ECON-1 and ECON-2.</p> <p>For more information on agricultural impact mitigation please see Master Response 18.</p> |
| 2106 | 7 | The Delta is home to a \$750 million recreational economy that includes water skiing, sailing, sport fishing, and pleasure boating. Marinas from downtown Stockton to the interior of the Delta are dependent on clean water, as are waterside eateries, bars, bait and tackle shops, boating clubs, and event venues. | <p>Please see Impact ECON-5 in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the Final EIR/EIS, regarding Effects on Recreational Economics as a Result of Constructing the Proposed Water Conveyance Facilities.</p> <p>For information on Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs related to recreation please see Appendix 3B of the Final EIR/EIS. Also see Chapter 15, Recreation.</p> <p>For information on water quality please see Master Response 14 and Chapter 8 of the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| 2106 | 8 | The Delta tunnels will make the Stockton Delta water intake project inoperable because the Delta water supply will become too salty. Municipal utilities (Stockton, Lodi, Tracy) won't be able to discharge wastewater without violating federal water laws. Residents will be paying for these new problems through higher water bills. Future business growth will become increasingly difficult with a diminished supply of clean water. (For reference to the water quality impacts as a result of the operation of the tunnels, please refer to the Restore the Delta/Joint letter on RDEIR/SDEIS Comments and Request for BDCP Agencies to Comply with the federal Clean Water Act by protecting designated/beneficial uses, meeting and exceeding water 1 quality criteria, and preventing degradation of San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary water quality, dated October 6, 2015. We incorporate by reference their comments into this letter.) | <p>The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The water quality modeling results indicate that annual average EC levels in the San Joaquin River at Prisoners' Point, which is a modeled channel location that is relatively close to the Stockton Delta water intake, are below the secondary MCLs for EC and would decrease slightly under the preferred Alternative 4A relative to the existing conditions and No Action conditions (refer to Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, Table EC-27). Though the EC objective that applies to the San Joaquin River between Jersey Point and Prisoners Point would be exceeded at Prisoners Point more often under Alternative 4A than under Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative (ELT), these exceedances are expected to be able to be addressed via real-time operations, including real time management of the north Delta and south Delta intakes, as well as Head of Old River Barrier management.</p> <p>See also Master Response 14 regarding water quality. For information on operational criteria please see</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|---|
| | | | Master Response 28. |
| 2106 | 9 | If Delta farms could survive the impacts of a 14-year construction project that will run seven days a week, 24 hours per day, they will not be able to farm with saltwater, as the goal of the tunnels project is to move Sacramento River freshwater quickly past Stockton to the federal and state water project intakes near Tracy. | <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, of the EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels. Please also see response to comment 2106-9 for more information.</p> |
| 2106 | 10 | Marinas will be left high and dry, and increased concentration of pollutants will make Delta recreation non-existent. Their contributing revenues spent at local businesses will dry up. | <p>The potential for water conveyance operations to affect water quality conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including mitigation measures), and associated effects on recreation and socioeconomics is assessed in detail in the EIR/EIS. Please see Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, and Chapter 15, Recreation. Water quality is discussed in Chapter 8.</p> <p>Where significant impacts to uses would occur due to alternatives, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided. See response to comment 2106-7 for more information regarding recreation and Master Response 14 regarding water quality.</p> |
| 2106 | 11 | Stockton's and San Joaquin County's present and future economy, and entire way of life, are tied to adequate water quality and quantity in the Delta. The Delta tunnels will destroy access to that water supply that this city needs to prosper and will have a detrimental effect on Stockton's recovery from bankruptcy, as well as Stockton's \$385 million plus annual gross domestic product. | Please see chapter 8 of the Final EIR/EIS and Master Response 14 regarding water quality. For information on the project's purpose and need please see response to comment 2106-1. Socioeconomic impacts are discussed in Chapter 16 of the Final EIR/EIS. For information on mitigation please see Master Response 22 and Appendix 3B of the Final EIR/EIS. |
| 2106 | 12 | <p>Within the BDCP Chapter 8, financing plan, there is only a discussion of how environmental mitigation costs are accounted for (or not) and possible sources of funds for environmental mitigation costs.</p> <p>The one limited exception within the Bay Delta Conservation Plan is "property tax and revenue assessment replacement" mitigation. Section 8.2.3.23 of Chapter 8 in BDCP refers to California Water Code Section of 85089 requiring: "New Delta conveyance facilities are required to offset loss of local property tax and assessment revenues resulting from location, construction, mitigation, or operation of water conveyance facilities [and] must be offset by the Implementation Office."</p> <p>This Water Code Section is from the Delta Reform Act. The language of 85089 is not tied to a "Bay Delta Conservation Plan" but to "new Delta conveyance facilities" so it follows that by statute, property tax/assessments revenue "replacement" must still be part of Alternative 4A, the new preferred alternative, under California Water Fix.</p> | <p>The proposed project (Alternative 4A) does include property tax/assessments revenue replacement. Currently, over \$48 million will be set aside for this purpose (see Exhibit E of Design and Construction Enterprise Draft Agreement released by DWR on January 15, 2016, "2081/Section 7 Mitigation Cost Estimate" Table). Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and funding for the proposed project. For information on the Delta Reform Act please see Master Response 31.</p> <p>Additional information on mitigation please review Master Response 22.</p> |
| 2106 | 13 | Table 8-41, pages 8-7 5 of Chapter 8, shows that there would be no capital costs associated with Water Code 85089 compliance, but there would \$226.0 million of operational costs for the BDCP version of the tunnels project. Of this, only 43.3 percent would be paid by the water contractors, the beneficiaries of the project, for a total of \$97.7 million over 50 years. That is just under \$2 million (i.e., about \$1 .95 million) in | See response to comment 2106-12. |

| RECIRCltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|---|
| | | property tax and revenue offsets per year to Delta counties, cities and special districts affected by the project. That is a pittance, when one considers that these revenue subventions (i.e., replacements) may be about 1.5 to 2 percent of the total value of the lands directly and indirectly affected by the project, and that there are 5 Delta counties, large cities like Stockton, small towns, and literally dozens of reclamation and other special districts within the Delta that would be forced to split that replaced revenue. This proposed property tax/revenue "replacement" fund will allocate tax revenue scraps to the greater Stockton metropolitan area and San Joaquin County. | |
| 2106 | 14 | Appendix 8A of the BDCP noted that there would be some \$248 million in "incremental costs for EIR/EIS mitigation measures" not elsewhere counted by conservation measures. The items that they counted included mitigations for agricultural land, air quality, biological resources, and cultural resources. However, air quality accounted for nearly \$212 million of these costs over ten years (part of the construction period), where they would pay about \$21.17 million per year. See Table 8.A-62, p. 8.A-172. This would leave only \$36 million for mitigation to damage to agricultural lands within the five Delta counties, an insignificant mitigation fund for the damage that would be inflicted on Stockton and the greater San Joaquin County agricultural industry. There is no further discussion of these mitigation costs in the DREIR/S for California WaterFix. Consequently, this appendix not only reveals that air quality impacts experienced by the Delta will require significant mitigation, but that little funding will be left for construction mitigation of family farming businesses that are the primary driving force for the region's economy. | For information on agricultural impact mitigation please see Master Response 18. Please also see Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, of the Final EIR/EIS. |
| 2106 | 15 | An erosion of current property tax revenues, in addition to the lost direct and indirect economic activity and related revenues, would make the residents of Stockton and San Joaquin County the economic losers with construction and operation of the project. Because the water code as written does not require a broader economic calculation of impacts resulting from the construction and operation of the Delta Tunnels, this analysis has been all together left out of the EIR/S and DREIR/S. | See response to comment 2106-6 regarding socioeconomics. |
| 2106 | 16 | When one considers that Stockton and San Joaquin County's primary industries are agriculture, transportation, Port of Stockton operations, and construction, and that all these industries are tied to sufficient Delta water quality and quantity, it becomes clear that the economic impacts will be significant. In fact, it is not hyperbole when one recognizes that the primary beneficiaries of Delta water exports are a limited number of growers on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley and that this project may very well end up facilitating not only the transfer of water at unsustainable levels, but middle class wealth from one region to solve the unquenchable economic demands of large-scale corporate farms in the San Joaquin Valley. | Final EIR/EIS Chapter 5, Water Supply, provides information on the amount of water that would be exported under each alternative, including the preferred alternative (Alternative 4A). Final EIR/EIS Chapter 8, Water Quality, provides an assessment of water quality impacts occurring under each alternative. Please also see Master Response 14 regarding water quality. Final EIR/EIS Chapter 5 Water Supply, Appendix 5A BDCP EIR/EIS Modeling Technical Appendix, Tables C-52-6-2 and C-52-6-3 provides information on North of Delta and South of Delta water deliveries to SWP and CVP agricultural, municipal and industrial, refuge users in major hydrologic regions for Alternative 4A. This table helps place in context the changes in deliveries to these users under Alternative 4A when compared to the No Action Alternative. Long term average agricultural deliveries to SWP contractors in the San Joaquin Valley would not change. Long term average agricultural deliveries to CVP contractors would decrease by 7,000 acre feet. See response to comment 2106-6 regarding socioeconomics. For information on water rights and area of origin please see Master Response 32 and Master Response 26, respectively. For information on the project's purpose and need please see response to comment 2106-1. |
| 2106 | 17 | The people of Stockton and San Joaquin County-area businesses depend on good water quality in the Delta for their livelihoods and quality of life. A significant portion of 300,000 Stockton and 700,000 San Joaquin County residents depend on the Delta as their primary drinking water supply. To protect this area's economic and water supply ties to the Delta, protecting and enhancing the Delta's water quality is essential. | Please see response to comment 2106-16. For information on mitigation please see Master Response 18, Master Response 22, and Appendix 3B of the Final EIR/EIS. |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | <p>Therefore, we [the Greater Stockton Chamber of Commerce] request state and federal rejection of the proposed Delta Water Tunnels Project, as Stockton and San Joaquin County would experience a disproportionate and unjust portion of the significant and adverse economic and environmental impacts resulting from the project.</p> | |
| 2107 | 1 | <p>ZeeWeed (Ultra Filtration) is an example of the "Best Available Technology (BAT)" for the environment and for the project of exporting large quantities of clean water. Co-equal goals as required by law.</p> <p>Comment: Why is Ultra Filtration not being considered instead of the very poor "State of the Art" fish screens for the exporting of water? If costs, then we now know the cost of the environmental health, but a documented study should be done, so we know a better cost estimate for the cost of our environment verses the cost of water for export.</p> <p>I will use the term ZeeWeed as an example of Ultra Filtration in this document, but there are many manufactures of Ultra Filtration Membranes. I am retired and do not sell ZeeWeed, but I do love the product and what it does.</p> <p>Pros and Cons:</p> <p>-Costs: ZeeWeed 500 is modular and can be installed at one site to extract all the water needed without settling ponds. One or more troughs can be created to allow the water to flow in and around the open water hollow fiber ZeeWeed membranes to extract only the water (not the nutrients, fish food and other environmental features that make up the surrounding water). Higher upfront cost for ZeeWeed Hollow Fibers, but less infrastructure costs makes ZeeWeed a less costly choice. Fish Screens proposed requires large settling pond, pumps for mixing and the ponds have to be regularly maintained, so it will have a higher cost of construction with 3 to 5 sites proposed and maintenance of screens, ponds and pumps.</p> <p>-Pre-Screens: ZeeWeed would require a pre-screen like the great fish screens that are being looked at, but I would recommend something more like the screens that we all use for windows and patio doors, just enough to keep out larger fish. It can be installed in a zig-zag motion like a car's oil or air filter if the rate of flow through the screen material is needed and modular like 5-foot sections that can be easily taken out and replaced as needed. Proposed fish screens do not need prescreens, but should be made modular for maintenance purposes and installed in a zig-zag pattern to reduce the speed of water flow through the screens.</p> <p>-Environment: ZeeWeed causes zero harm to the environment and is actually helpful because it will concentrates the fish food at a location for the fish to thrive without harming any aquatic life. Fish screens kill aquatic life and the setup with the settling ponds takes the nutrients and other small life in the water food chain.</p> <p>-Food Chain: ZeeWeed does not kill fish or any part of the aquatic food chain, whereas fish screens and settling ponds kill parts of the food chain and removes it from the water ways and the Delta.</p> <p>-Energy: ZeeWeed can run using nature to power it (which would be zero energy) but then you would have to lift the clean water, which would be better to lift the water in a water tower to get better flow to its destination since the trace pumps and all sites considered are at about the same elevation and the higher pressure means smaller pipes are need, leading to lower project costs. ZeeWeed needs air bubbles and reverse</p> | <p>This comment is an endorsement for an intake filtration system. The current intake screen system design has been coordinated with fish and wildlife agencies and is the preferred approach to fish screen design.</p> |

| RECIRCltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|---|
| | | <p>flow to quickly and easily clean the hollow fibers. Fish screens need zero energy, but there is power needed for settling ponds and pumps. [A] good analyst should crunch the numbers and get the comparison, so we all know the true facts in the comparison.</p> <p>-Endangered Spices: ZeeWeed cannot kill any because the pores are too small and not enough pressure to trap fish or any organism. Whereas fish Screens can, have and will continue to kill endangered species so long as they are being used directly and indirectly.</p> | |
| 2107 | 2 | [ATT1: Fact sheet on ZeeWeed 500 Module.] | This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS. |
| 2107 | 3 | <p>Where do the so-called "State of the Art" fish screens fall on the following chart [ATT2]?</p> <p>Look where ZeeWeed is on the chart -- you can find it on the bottom of the chart marked in yellow showing that all items above may be filtered out and everything to the right cannot make it through the pores.</p> <p>Keep in mind that the cleaner the water is that is extracted the better quality of water that it is delivered, as well as keeping the environment that the water is taken from healthier.</p> <p>Co-equal goals is what is required by law, but it makes sense too.</p> | Appendix 3B, Construction Assumptions, as updated in the RDEIR/SDEIS, describes fish screens that would be used in the proposed project. They would consist of vertical stainless steel screen panels with stainless steel wire fabric designed to meet delta smelt criteria of 5 sq ft/cfs, with mesh openings of 1/16 in. The screen dimensions would vary depending on location, ranging from 10 to 22 ft high and from 915 to 1,935 ft long. Several traveling brush screen cleaning systems would be installed on each of the long sides on the water side of the intakes, and a traveling gantry crane may be placed on the top deck of the intakes. Screens also serve to filter large solids from entering the intake, minimizing sedimentation within the conduits. Under the modified pipeline/tunnel alignment, a sediment jetting system would be placed behind the fish screens. |
| 2107 | 4 | [ATT2: Chart showing particle sizes filtered by various types of membranes.] | This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS. |
| 2107 | 5 | [ATT3: Pyramid drawing showing "Web of Life."] | This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS. |
| 2107 | 6 | <p>What should be screened out, just endangered fish (like Delta smelt) or also the smaller organisms that the fish and other smaller forms of life feed on? Check out the web link for more information on the web of life.</p> <p>NOAA Education: http://www.education.noaa.gov/Marine_Life/Aquatic_Food_Webs.html</p> <p>Per NOAA's Web site: Big fish eat little fish; that's how the food cycle works. Of course, there's more to it than that. A whirlwind spiral up an aquatic food chain goes like this: Phytoplankton feed the zooplankton that feed the small fish and crustaceans that feed the larger fish that feed the even bigger fish that feed us.</p> | The fish screens would be meeting fish agency criteria, which means that smaller organisms would have the potential to be entrained. The Biological Assessment of Alternative 4A (California WaterFix) for ESA-listed fishes conducted an analysis of potential entrainment of phytoplankton carbon, which showed that losses would not be significant in relation to the overall stock within the Delta. |
| 2108 | 1 | The politics behind water rights in California and the private interest fundraising involved in this project dispute the very essence of state government working for the constituents and citizens that will be impacted by these decisions the most. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 2108 | 2 | The creations of "state-of-the-art fish screens" in the new pumps are not enough to protect the endangered Delta species. | In addition to the screen design and location for the NDD, the operational criteria included in the preferred alternative, 4A, is based on several years of coordination with fish agencies and incorporation of the best available science to avoid and minimize the effects of changes in Delta operations. |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|---|
| 2108 | 3 | The new proposed separate restoration project is far too small and not adequate compared to the enormous scope of this project. | <p>The California WaterFix (Alternative 4A) includes habitat restoration, enhancement and protection Environmental Commitments that would reduce the effects of constructing and operating the proposed water conveyance facilities. The acreage of required natural community is provided in Table 3-9 in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives. These acreages have been determined to be adequate for the purposes of reducing conveyance facility effects on natural communities and listed species.</p> <p>The California EcoRestore is a separate program to restore, enhance and protect habitat in the Delta. It is being implemented to improve the Delta ecosystem and is not directly related to reducing effect of Alternative 4A.</p> |
| 2108 | 4 | <p>We should be concerned about the state of our levees and it is my opinion that large-scale restoration projects across the state would be more efficient at preserving water levels. Tunnels while seemingly suitable methods of transportation often cause problems of their own. Leaking pipes will cause water loss and the size of the proposed pipes are simply inappropriate in consideration to habitat needs.</p> <p>Restoring Sacramento floodplains and investing in levee infrastructure and the restoration of channels across the state would in my eyes be a better option for "fixing" our current water transport dilemma.</p> | <p>Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state's long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. These habitat restoration actions will be implemented faster and more reliably by separating them from the water conveyance facility implementation. Also, please refer to Master Response 37 for information on why storage was not included in the proposed project, Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives and Master Response 3 for information on the project purpose and need.</p> |
| 2108 | 5 | I agree that updating or replacing the current pumps in the southern Delta is important to protect the water supply from becoming salinized. I do not agree that we should build more conveyance facilities to help pump an increasing amount of water away from the watershed to places that are essentially deserts and did not have efficient urban planning to begin with. | <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> |
| 2108 | 6 | I think that instead of stealing water from the place it originates the state government needs to find a way to centralize water collection in the south. | <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use and Master Response 26 for additional information on water rights and changes in Delta exports.</p> |
| 2108 | 7 | If the goal of any government is to provide sustainable management of a watershed I believe this government is not upholding its promise to constituents. We cannot revert back from the knowledge we have discovered about human impact and our past management mistakes. In a day and age where we have so many new options to choose from I find it inconceivable how any group of people could, in good standing with themselves, propose the expansion of a project that is already clearly inefficient. | <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, turbidity, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> |
| 2108 | 8 | For the sake of conserving the Golden State I hope this project never passes any of the NEPA standards. I hope that individuals more savvy in law will find the flaws in this plan proving it to be in violation of environmental law. | <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> |
| 2108 | 9 | I appeal to California Legislatures to completely discard the project or change the objective from a tunnel project to a desalination plan or another inventive way to alleviate the water shortage, because the livelihood of this globally unique resource is of far greater importance than money could ever be. | <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management and Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.</p> |
| 2109 | 1 | We are writing to express our opposition to the Delta Tunnels Plan. | <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|---|
| | | <p>The health and safety of the Delta has been given almost no consideration in the ongoing water grab that had great and noble intentions fifty years ago but has been subverted by large agricultural businesses.</p> <p>The recent proposed Federal settlement with Westlands Water District shows the inevitable outcome when unforeseen events impinge on big agri-businesses: they convince government that they are too big to fail, and their business risks are now entitlements that are to be paid for by the rest of us.</p> <p>The Department of Water Resources needs to prepare alternatives to the Delta Tunnels that show the people of California ways that their taxes and water bills can be used to enrich all of us, not just some of us.</p> | <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 5.</p> |
| 2109 | 2 | <p>The cities of Southern California and their water agencies have done an admirable job of being stewards of a precious resource. If the Delta Tunnels budget were applied to water recycling, levee upgrades, groundwater recharging, and other efficiency programs statewide, there would be ample water for cities and the true "family farms" in California.</p> | <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p> |
| 2110 | 1 | <p>I am completely against the delta tunnels. These tunnels would destroy the delta by not letting the natural flows go through the delta. This change would disrupt and destroy fisheries.</p> | <p>The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in Delta ecosystem and aquatic impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> |
| 2111 | 1 | <p>WHEREAS, water supplies from Northern California that move across the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta are vital to the economy of California, serving 25 million people from the Bay Area to the Mexican border and supporting agriculture throughout the Central Valley; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, the Bay Delta is the 550,000-acre estuary where the rivers of the Sierra Nevada merge before heading west to the San Francisco Bay; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, the Bay Delta is in a state of environmental stress due to the loss of wetlands habitat, invasive species, pesticide runoff, a depletion of native food supplies, pumping operations, and other factors; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, the decline in the Bay Delta's health threatens the unique environment and water supplies that are key to the California economy;</p> <p>NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board hereby supports</p> <p>"Alternative 4A" of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix process and the concepts in the modified Plan advanced by Governor Brown and Interior Secretary Jewell.</p> | <p>The issues raised by the commenters address the merits of the project and do not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.</p> |

| RECIRCltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | <p>PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, County of Los Angeles, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on the</p> <p>15th day of October, 2015.</p> | |
| 2111 | 2 | <p>WHEREAS, the Bay Delta's levees are not engineered to protect the State's water supply distribution systems from a major earthquake, and multiple levee failures could disrupt water deliveries and the State economy for up to three years, particularly in the San Gabriel Valley region of Southern California, where significant areas are 100% dependent on the State Water Project for imported water supplies;</p> <p>NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board hereby supports</p> <p>"Alternative 4A" of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix process and the concepts in the modified Plan advanced by Governor Brown and Interior Secretary Jewell.</p> <p>PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, County of Los Angeles, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on the</p> <p>15th day of October, 2015.</p> | The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. |
| 2111 | 3 | <p>WHEREAS, State and Federal agencies, via the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) process, have worked for nine years towards developing a comprehensive package of ecosystem and water system improvements to address both current conflicts in the Bay Delta and long-term threats to the State's water supplies; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, the modified preferred alternative, "Alternative 4A", delineates a new approach, with the WaterFix intake/conveyance improvements proceeding as a stand-alone project; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, the approximately 30,000 acres of proposed Delta ecosystem improvements, would proceed on a parallel, but separate program now known as California EcoRestore; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, the rationale of the modification, "Alternative 4A", is to identify an achievable path to permitting given overwhelming scientific uncertainty on how to best manage the Delta in the coming decades; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, a successful final plan would accomplish several water supply reliability needs, such as a consistent ability to capture wet-period supplies, and would improve reliability of deliveries in an average year and would protect supplies long-term; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, "Alternative 4A" continues to advance the objective of improving water quality of State Water Project supplies and the objective of avoiding conflicts with migrating fish species; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, "Alternative 4A" continues to provide the necessary design and system redundancy to reduce both seismic and climate change risks, as reducing these risks is</p> | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | <p>paramount to water supply reliability; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, failure to take decisive actions would be an unacceptable risk to the environment of the Bay Delta and the economy of California, specifically in Southern California and the San Gabriel Valley;</p> <p>NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board hereby supports</p> <p>"Alternative 4A" of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix process and the concepts in the modified Plan advanced by Governor Brown and Interior Secretary Jewell.</p> <p>PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of San Gabriel Valley Council of</p> <p>Governments, County of Los Angeles, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on the</p> <p>15th day of October, 2015.</p> | |
| 2112 | 1 | <p>I am a citizen living in Walnut Creek. In September 2009 I attended an informational meeting on the Delta Vision Strategic Plan at the local Leshner Center. I still have the glossy spiral presentation book. I was initially impressed with the presentation. Over the years since then I have attended informational meetings and rallies in Stockton, Walnut Grove, and Antioch. I went out to physically see where the fish screens were used. I quickly became convinced that the nice-sounding goals were hijacked by the large agricultural money interests in this state.</p> <p>Some of the reasons for opposition to the tunnels:</p> <p>-No cost-benefit analysis that includes the value of freshwater to the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary has ever been presented.</p> <p>-How does the California WaterFix help reduce the reliance on Delta imports as mandated in the 2009 Delta Reform Act?</p> <p>-The tunnels will not create more water; rather, [they] will contribute to more saltwater intrusion into the Delta that further degrades the fish and aquatic life.</p> <p>-I am appalled at the trampling of the property rights of Delta farmers and their livelihood and inability to leave their farms to their families since property will be acquired through eminent domain.</p> <p>-The cost for this project has risen over the years and the public who pays the bills have not been able vote on it.</p> <p>-If this project is so beneficial, why have the legislative representatives Delta not supported it?</p> <p>-The plan does not live up Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>-The plan doesn't adhere to the Clean Water Act.</p> | <p>It should be recognized that CEQA does not require the analysis of socioeconomic effects unless there is a nexus to adverse effects to the physical environment. However, since this is a joint CEQA and NEPA document, and NEPA has different direction related to socioeconomics, there was a robust discussion on socioeconomics. For example, although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A would require much less conversion of agricultural land to restored or protected habitat than the alternatives that include a HCP/NCCP, agricultural land will still be affected by implementing any of the alternatives (ES.1.13). Similarly, Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A would have lesser socioeconomic effects associated with agricultural land conversions compared with other action alternatives.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act as well as federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, turbidity, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Chapter 3.4.1.2 of the 2015 RDEIR/SEIS describes the operation requirements for the project.</p> |
| 2112 | 2 | <p>Alternatives to the tunnel:</p> | <p>Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | <p>-More aggressive water efficiency programs statewide</p> <p>-Funding water recycling [and] recharging groundwater projects</p> <p>-Retiring thousands of acres of impaired [and] pollution generating farmlands in the southern San Joaquin [and] using those lands for solar generation</p> <p>-Improve Delta levees [and] increase freshwater flows</p> <p>-Support efforts to replace old, large, leaking pipes</p> | <p>information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.</p> |
| 2113 | 1 | <p>We want you to know we oppose these Delta Tunnels!</p> <p>How did this pass a complete environment impact report? How can this project mitigate any of the damage it's going to cause to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fish, wildlife and endangered species 2. Underground streams/waterways 3. Water for the areas you are grabbing it from 4. Farmlands 5. Food for our country 6. Livelihood for the farmers and communities affected 7. Loss of income tax to the State of California 8. Water quality 9. Saltwater intrusion 10. Public health and wealth given to private hands through water transfers 11. Loss of employment 12. Cost of unemployment <p>The estimated cost is \$15 billion; you and I know it will be at least four times this estimate. These tunnels won't help desperate communities during the drought, or fund innovative water conservation, or stormwater capture, or water recycling projects that cities are eager to build. Changing the name to California WaterFix or California EcoRestore does not change the facts. This project does not give us one drop of new water. Building something for new water is what we should be concentrating on instead of grabbing water.</p> | <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, turbidity, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies discuss community character in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Please see chapter 15 for a discussion on impacts to recreation. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.</p> |
| 2113 | 2 | <p>We need to be using our resources wisely and should be looking at dam projects for California with these proposed/other funds. California has a voracious appetite for water that will not be quenched unless we use a common sense approach to truly rectify the problem that helps all citizens of California, not just an elite few.</p> | <p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p> |
| 2114 | 1 | <p>Regarding the twin tunnel water project that is open for comment until October 30th:</p> | <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|---|
| | | <p>-Doesn't solve the water problem for the state.</p> <p>-Doesn't take into consideration Delta habitat needs.</p> <p>-Doesn't conserve limited state resources financially.</p> <p>-Doesn't promote water conservation.</p> <p>For these reasons, I am opposed to the tunnels being built in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.</p> | <p>and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, turbidity, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> |
| 2115 | 1 | <p>My feelings on the twin tunnel project are the same as the peripheral canal project years ago.</p> <p>-It is a water grab by special interests.</p> <p>-It does not add a drop of water.</p> <p>-We're financing corporate farmers.</p> <p>I am against this project.</p> | <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, turbidity, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> |
| 2116 | 1 | [ATT1: "A plea to Gov. Brown." Letter to the editor, Stockton Record.] | <p>This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| 2117 | 1 | <p>First of all, the name WaterFix is not a suitable name for the twin tunnel project/fiasco. The cost of the so-called twin tunnels is exorbitant and it seems to me the money would be better spent on desalination plants similar to the one built in my hometown of Carlsbad in San Diego County to supply residents to the east of town. This project took a lot of heat, but it has proven successful and will be providing 50 million gallons daily by the end of this year to residents and will for years to come. The pipe is 54 inches in diameter. Just think!</p> <p>If projects are to be built, let them be from the coast where water plants could be built and water piped to the San Joaquin Valley for farmers in dry years. If California loses the farms we now have, what will become of this area, and not only our area, but the whole state of California and for that matter, the whole United States of America that these farms now feed? It would put us over a barrel, dependent on foreign countries to provide food for our tables. If it comes to that, let's pray for a sound foreign trade pact.</p> <p>Figure out the closest, easiest, cheapest route up over the Coastal Range to the Valley, then we can route it north or south as needed, but not to Southern California. I believe piping it would be much cheaper because in addition to the actual pipe needed there is the digging aspect. Even San Diego County is not in favor of these Brown (gray area) tunnels because they are taking care of their needs on their own.</p> <p>The reason this tunnel project does not provide a single drop of new water is that you cannot manufacture water, but desalination is basically new water. We also need more storage areas.</p> <p>This is our two cents worth.</p> | <p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions. As described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS (2013), desalination was included as part of Alternative B7. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component; it will be evaluated by water agencies on a local/regional level.</p> <p>Desalination, the process of removing salt and other minerals from seawater to make it suitable for drinking or irrigation, is being implemented in several California communities. However, it has not proven viable to secure adequate water supplies to meet California's needs due to high costs and energy demands.</p> <p>Today, desalination creates an estimated 84,000 acre-feet of potable water a year in the state, mostly through treatment of brackish groundwater, which is less salty and cheaper to treat than sea water. In comparison, the proposed project would secure an estimated 4.7 to 5.2 million acre-feet of water to supply more than 25 million people and 3 million acres of farmland.</p> <p>Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Local water agencies will need to invest in additional strategies and technologies, including desalination, to meet future water demand.</p> <p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | | <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.</p> <p>For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p> |
| 2118 | 1 | <p>Looking at what was commented on five years ago, many have hoped that certain lessons have, by now, been learned. Tragically, those lessons appear NOT to have been learned. It would seem the drive to plunder Northern California of her water in manner eerily reminiscent of the plunder of Lake Owens at the hands of the Los Angeles Dept. of Water & Power (LADWP). Not only that, but it would appear that nearly all pretext of conservation has been the scaled back, by at least 70%, from the Plan. Even before the so-called “conservation measures” were scaled back, by at least 70%, it was never any kind of conservation plan (the “conservation measures” having been included for the apparent purpose of making more politically palatable the idea of wanton aquaplunder of, both surface & subsurface, sources of water, all north & upstream of the Sacramento / San Joaquin Delta, by well monied interests, both in the western San Joaquin Valley and in the L.A. Basin). Before I go on here, I must herenow pose the following question, "How is it at all true, this thing we are being attempted to be led to believe; that somehow no species listed for protection under ESA can be properly protected apart from the wanton & abject aquaplunder of all points in California north & upstream of the Delta? How is it true, this thing we are being attempted to be led to believe, this thing we are being told by at least some promoters of the BDCP?" The short answer? That idea of theirs, regardless of the source of it, is patently false! Looking at what was commented on five years ago, many have hoped that certain lessons have, by now, been learned. Tragically, those lessons appear not to have been learned. For the past several years, the purpose of the BDCP, the Peripheral Canal Project proposal, & the Twin Tunnels proposal, has been the naked aquaplunder of Northern California water sources by L.A. basin & by well monied western San Joaquin Valley interests.</p> | <p>Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project’s facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>For more information regarding the differences between the proposed project and the peripheral canals please see Master Response 36.</p> |
| 2118 | 1 | <p>We believe it is more important to Governor Brown to leave his mark on California history, good or bad. He does not care about the will of the people of California.</p> <p>He doesn’t care about Northern California or the Delta region. His loyalty is to Southern California and the people who helped him get elected. He owes them.</p> | <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> |
| 2118 | 2 | <p>Los Angeles needs to build more water storage. Why is it up to Northern California to save water for them?</p> | <p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p> |
| 2119 | 1 | <p>They are talking about an extremely wet winter coming. Get your heads out of the sand and start promoting building more dams. That’s what saved us in the past. Our politicians have been bucking building more dams for years in Northern and Central California.</p> | <p>DWR’s fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|---|
| | | | (Alternatives) and Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information. |
| 2119 | 2 | As far as Los Angeles, they can start desalting ocean water. | For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. |
| 2119 | 3 | Los Angeles has sucked the Colorado River dry; now they want to dry up the most fertile farmland that feeds the world. | The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via California WaterFix proposed conveyance facilities. |
| 2119 | 4 | If the population is growing too fast, we need to cut off immigration for about 25 years. Then bring our military boys home to protect our United States -- Hawaii and Alaska. | The comment raises an import policy issue concerning sustainable growth in California. However, the comment does not question the growth inducement analysis or conclusions of Chapter 30. |
| 2119 | 5 | I don't have a fancy computer, just a pen! I am 85 years old -- farmed with my late husband. I sure don't like what has happened to our country -- guess I won't have to see it in my life. I fear for my grandchildren and great-grandchildren. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. |
| 2120 | 1 | I am 87 years old. My wife is 80. We are both registered voters and have been since we were eligible. We have been through three administrations of our goofy governor and seen the results of his proposals. He comes up with hair brain ideas that do not make sense. We are definitely against the tunnels. It should be put on the ballots and be up to the voters to decide. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 2121 | 1 | You will not build those Delta twin tunnels and devastate the economy of my home. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding. |
| 2124 | 1 | I am very much opposed to the construction of the proposed "twin tunnels." I cannot imagine how anyone intelligent and well-educated could think that this is a good idea. It will obviously cause extreme saltwater intrusion into the Delta. Do we not care about the damage that will cause to the farmers of the region, not to mention the wildlife? That this project seems to be moving ahead in spite of all its negative effects is shameful. | The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. |
| 2124 | 2 | Southern California need to build water capture facilities and desalination plants, not conscript the water Northern California needs. | The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of one particular water supply augmentation approach (more storage and desalination facilities in Southern California) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected. The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully considered all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS. In response to public input, several new alternatives have been studied in the Recirculated DEIR/EIS and a new preferred Alternative (4A) identified. |
| 2125 | 1 | In 2015 I've seen almost every stream and tributary to the river dry. This is not the norm. The Sacramento River cannot provide water for the entire state. | The EIR/EIS evaluates long-term operation of the SWP and CVP over an 82-year long hydrologic period with extended wet periods and dry/critical dry periods. The EIR/EIS surface water conditions analyses includes several critical dry years in which some of the streams are predicted to be dry with or without implementation of the project. The evaluation is a comparative analysis to determine the incremental |

| RECIRCltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | | differences between conditions under the proposed project and other action alternatives and conditions under the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The analyses were not conducted to identify specific values or to respond to short-term emergency situations, such as the ongoing drought. Separate engineering and environmental studies have been and will continue to be prepared when water quality criteria and other regulations are modified in emergencies. |
| 2125 | 2 | Are we going to farm California until there is no more water left to farm? Will the Delta become an extinct tributary to the Pacific Ocean? There is too much going on with the ecosystem that we are not familiar with. People and government are too eager to fix. We have existing water laws and transfer that need to be cleaned up. Let's not add more cleanup on top of existing. I believe it is a bad plan. | As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources in the Delta. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. |
| 2126 | 1 | Please vote no on the Governor's plan. Stop the tunnels. Water in Northern California must be used in Northern California. We do not need another Owens Valley. Save the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 26 for additional information on effects on northern California. |
| 2127 | 1 | I am a registered Democrat and am writing to advise you that I am against the twin tunnels. There are better fixes such as dams, etc being built in Southern region. Please vote against the twin tunnels or voice your opposition to it as my vote. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind Master Response 6 regarding demand management, and Master Response 37 regarding water storage. |
| 2128 | 1 | Southern California has received 4 to 6 inches of rain in [the] last few months but that water just flowed out to the Pacific. Why are we not allowed to build dams in California? Why [is] Northern California taking down dams? You know pulling water out of the Delta only pulls in more salt water. Please do not build the twin tunnels. Please help our farmers and save our Delta. Why are we not finding out from Israel and Australia how they save and recycle their water? Please stop the tunnels. | Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management and Master Response 37 regarding storage. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need. |
| 2129 | 1 | The Delta Tunnels as far as I am concerned are a big waste of money all for southern California. It is high time that southern California takes care of its self. It is time they find their own water sources. Northern California can not continue to send them water. Southern California needs to start using desalination plants to supplement their water sources. | For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California. |
| 2130 | 1 | As a 3rd generation Californian I strongly object to the tunnel plan. It would shift water support presently barely adequate for agriculture and fisheries in the central and | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | northern parts of the Sacramento Valley to agriculture and cities to the south. In the delta and Sacramento Valley we are blessed with good soil that naturally grows valuable crops, while the former hardpan and desert to the south requires excessive water due to mineral and climate problems. Let's not steal from what nature gave us in cropland and fisheries in order to enrich other parts of the state. | California WaterFix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 26 for additional information on effects on northern California. |
| 2131 | 1 | The Tunnels Plan for the Bay-Delta is ill-advised, wasteful, and unnecessary. Please stop this project immediately. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 2132 | 1 | As a resident of the Discovery Bay Delta area, I can't believe our state government would be considering such a drastic step as constructing two huge tunnels to funnel the fresh water from the Delta to Southern California so they could continue developing when they can't support what they have now. Are there no conscientious politicians that would fight this proposal? 1. We can't support the cost. 2. It will devastate the Delta-Bay Area habitat, property rights and value. 3. The southern half of the state of California must live within their means and resources. Are our Congressmen and legislators so corrupt they can be persuaded to vote for projects that harm their constituents? I pray somehow, someday you come to your senses and do the right thing, cancel this insane and harmful ill-planned project. | The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Responses 5. |
| 2133 | 1 | As homeowners in the Delta, we are incensed that this project is considered anything but a destruction force. Pumping huge amounts of fresh water out of the Delta will only slow its flow and accelerate the destruction of the fisheries, turn vibrant marshes into stagnant cesspools, destroy family farms and leave vast pits of chemical waste in our neighborhoods. Governor Brown and the Los Angeles DPW [Department of Powered Water] seem bent on turning the Delta into another Owens Valley. | The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors. Importantly, all water exported by the SWP and CVP is subject to the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Through the Legislature and through executive agencies, California has embraced water conservation on numerous fronts, as have many California water agencies. Many of these efforts are highlighted in Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, which describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply, including recycled water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. For more information regarding alternatives development, water demand management, and purpose and need please see Master Response 4, Master Response 6, and Master Response 3. |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| 2133 | 2 | <p>Not one stakeholder in the Delta was involved in this plan. It was formulated to prevent input from the locals, voters and the legislature. The comment period was shortened to suppress the resistance and prevent any delays. It is a perfect example of water policy corruption and must be stopped.</p> <p>This idea was advanced by Brown and son years ago, put to the voters and soundly defeated. They would do the same now if given the chance. Bury this boondoggle once and for all and actually save the Delta.</p> | <p>Please see Master Response 39 and Master Response 42 regarding the comment period duration and the treatment of public comments.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 32 of the Final EIR/EIS and Master Response 64 for information regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP). More information on how DWR has developed the project in an open and transparent manner is provided in Master Response 41.</p> |
| 2134 | 1 | Please stop the tunnels! This is a ridiculous idea! | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. |
| 2135 | 1 | No tunnels! Let's stop the constant assault on the farmers' ability to provide food [and] jobs for the Valley [and] the nation! | <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; Lead Agencies have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.</p> |
| 2136 | 1 | <p>This plan strikes me as being a water grab from Southern California that would further destroy the Sacramento Delta and surrounding farm land.</p> <p>I have been fishing in the Delta for the last 40 years and have seen the dramatic decline in wildlife first hand. The over pumping of delta water has severely affected bass, striper and catfish populations, impacting the many recreational opportunities the Delta offers.</p> <p>Please reconsider this plan and stop the destruction of the Delta.</p> | The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. |
| 2137 | 1 | I have studied; I have researched; I have listened; too many "ifs", unknowns, and federal regulations that prevent it. No on tunnels. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. |
| 2138 | 1 | <p>I am providing the following comments regarding the proposed Delta Tunnels:</p> <p>Not only will the tunnels not serve to add or enhance any additional water passing to the San Francisco Bay -- quite the contrary -- it is a very expensive project and provides no guarantees for water users. Only users south of the Delta will benefit, to the detriment and destruction of Delta farm and migrating fish.</p> | <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| 2138 | 2 | It is an incredible financial risk to water users and taxpayers. | Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and funding sources. For more information regarding purpose and need, please see Master Response 3. |
| 2138 | 3 | It will likely increase saltwater intrusion further into the Delta while increasing exports from an already drought-affected Delta. | By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 14 (Water Quality). |
| 2138 | 4 | Big Agriculture is seeking to now drain the Sacramento River because it has not prudently managed its existing contract water and groundwater to provide for future needs. | The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via California WaterFix proposed conveyance facilities. |
| 2138 | 5 | The Tunnels will imperil protected species via a scheme that isn't even legal, as federal agencies are not permitted to adversely alter critical habitat that is explicitly protected for the recovery of endangered fish. | The commenter does not offer evidence on how the project would have a significant impact on aquatic species related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Federal permits are being sought through the Section 7 process under the federal Endangered Species Act. No further comment is necessary. |
| 2138 | 6 | It is entirely inappropriate that California State agencies are already seeking Tunnel construction permits -- before the comment period has ended. Also, Southern California water agencies are seeking to buy up Delta farms for the Tunnels, which constitutes a water grab that would permanently harm Northern California water users, especially those in the Delta. | Please refer to Master Response 46, regarding permitting processes and the appropriateness of this approach and Master Response 29, regarding the Endangered Species Act and timing for completing the ESA Section 7 process. Decisions about approval of a particular alternative are not included in the EIR/EIS. Effects on water quality beneficial uses are presented in Chapter 8, Water Quality of this Final EIR/EIS. This analysis indicates that changes in water quality constituents that could affect use of Delta water are either less than significant or could be mitigated to less than significant levels. |
| 2138 | 7 | Funds intended for the Delta Tunnels could better be spent on shovel-ready water sustainable projects in California. It has been reported that the cost of the tunnels, after including borrowing interest, will run to \$60 billion+. It would be money wasted -- only serving wealthy venture capital "farmers" on lands much more appropriate for solar farms. | DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. The project would cost approximately \$15 billion to build (not \$60 billion). Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation. |
| 2138 | 8 | This project is not only insulting to Northern California water users but is fiscally irresponsible. Please dump this idea and use available funding for more realistic and sustainable projects. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. |
| 2139 | 1 | The name of this project is certainly a misnomer. Conservation? No, it's wanton destruction. We also live in Southern California and see the effects of water diversion from the Salton Sea. An absolute travesty. We need a sustainable way to manage water supplies. These tunnels would be quite a | The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | <p>boon to big agriculture. Big agriculture is responsible for a tremendous amount of water waste which should be recycled, sucking irreplaceable water supplies from centuries-old underground aquifers, polluting our water with animal waste and other agricultural chemicals.</p> <p>Our Delta region is an irreplaceable treasure.</p> <p>How can we spend this much money to subsidize big agriculture when our infrastructure is teetering and we are 46th in the nation in education? Who will pay when our obsolete dams collapse? Voters have approved temporary measures to increase school spending. What will happen when these expire? Schools will return to 49th in the nation, but we'll have tunnels!</p> <p>Time to rethink our priorities in Sacramento and make California a leader again in something other than tunnels and fracking.</p> | including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. |
| 2141 | 1 | The tunnels that are proposed by Governor Brown will undoubtedly benefit those living south of the Delta and the Bar Area. But at what cost to the environment of the present Delta? The smaller farms and orchards of the Delta lack the demographic and economic numbers to compete with agribusiness and urban areas of Central and Southern California, yet they should be protected. As well the wildlife and wetlands that have been part of the restoration projects of the U.S. Fish [and] Wildlife Service, The Nature Conservancy, and the counties within and on the edges of the Delta. | The proposed project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health. The proposed water conveyance facilities provide for new water supply intakes on the Sacramento River that would be operated in conjunction with the existing SWP and CVP south Delta export operations to improve conditions for Delta fish and aquatic resources and provide for a more predictable and reliable export water supply. While a petition for a change in point of diversion is being filed with the State Water Resources Control Board for use of these new intakes, no application for any new water right is being sought as a part of the proposed project. DWR and Reclamation will petition the State Water Board to modify the points of diversion for the existing water rights permits that are the basis for SWP and CVP Delta operations. Prior to approving these petitions, the State Water Board must find that the requested changes will not cause injury to any legal user of water or result in harm to fish or wildlife. Please see Master Response 26 regarding Delta exports, area of origin protections and existing water rights. |
| 2141 | 2 | I oppose the tunnel projects and favor instead more reservoir storage and stricter regulatory powers over water for all stakeholders, including agriculture, but especially urban developers with intentions of compromising water supply with additional construction of housing along the Delta's rim. | Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management and Master Response 37 regarding storage. Also, please see Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use. |
| 2142 | 1 | <p>No to the Delta tunnels!</p> <p>California is still in a drought and no matter what time of day, you still see companies, agricultural and homes watering constantly. Yet the rest of us who have followed the strict guidelines, are now facing water bill hikes.</p> <p>Now they want to water almond and pistachio orchards - What is going on?</p> <p>We are destroying the entire planet and for what - the bottom line!</p> <p>Brown should never have been elected - he's absolutely worthless just like his "bullet train to nowhere"!</p> | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 26 for additional information on effects on northern California.</p> |
| 2143 | 1 | If Governor Brown wants to really make an impact, maybe he could stop Nestle/Arrowhead from extracting water from a drought-plagued state, instead of destroying endangered species.... | This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | | to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 2144 | 1 | These tunnels are one of the most stupid ideas in California's history. Only an ignoramus would want them. Where does that place Jerry Brown? | This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. |
| 2145 | 1 | The Delta Water Tunnels would divert enormous quantities of freshwater that presently flow through the Sacramento River, sloughs, and the Delta before being diverted for export from the south Delta. Due to the new points of diversion north of the Delta, freshwater flows that presently contribute to water quality, water quantity, fish, fish habitat, and public health by flowing through the Delta would instead flow through massive tunnels, no longer providing benefits within the lower river, sloughs, and the Delta. | Please see Master Response 14 for additional information on water quality. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. |
| 2145 | 2 | The Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR)/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) actually claims there would be no adverse impacts under NEPA or CEQA from the Delta losing all that freshwater flow on water supply or water quality, or on fish and aquatic resources. (RDEIR/SDEIS Table ES-9, pp. ES-41-60; Appendix A, Ch. 31, Table 31-1, pp. 31-3 through 31-8). [Footnote 1: The Drafts do selectively admit some significant adverse environmental impacts on other issues that pose less of a threat to the Water Tunnels even being a lawful, let alone reasonable, alternative.] The BDCP/Water Fix Drafts are supposed to be environmental full disclosure documents. [Footnote 2: NEPA and CEQA are both "environmental full disclosure laws." <i>Silva v. Lynn</i> , 482 F.2d 1282, 1284 (1st Cir. 1973)(NEPA); <i>Communities for a Better Environment v. City of Richmond</i> , 184 Cal.App.4th 70, 88 (2010)(CEQA). Both laws require that an agency "use its best efforts to find out all that it reasonably can" about the subject project and its environmental impacts. <i>Barnes v. U.S. Dept. of Transp.</i> 655 F.3d 1124, 1136 (9th Cir. 2011)(NEPA); <i>Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova</i> , 40 Cal. 412, 428 (2007)(CEQA).] Whether from project-consultant bias or orders from above, it is arbitrary and unreasonable to falsely claim that taking significant quantities of freshwater flows away from the Delta does not have significant adverse environmental impacts on Delta water supply, water quality, fish, and fish habitat. The freshwater is the water supply for the Delta and is the habitat for the endangered and threatened species of salmon and other fish. | The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts (ESA), as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For additional information on the ESA please see Master Response 29. For more information regarding impacts to water supply, water quality, and aquatic resources and their associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 5, 8, and 11 of the FEIR/EIS and also Master Response 14. For more information regarding Environmental Commitments please see Appendix 3B and Master Response 22. |
| 2145 | 3 | As the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) said in its August 26, 2014, review of the Draft BDCP EIR/EIS: "Data and other information provided in the Draft EIS indicate that all CM1 [Tunnels project] alternatives may contribute to declining populations of Delta smelt, longfin smelt, green sturgeon, and winter-run, spring-run, fall-run and late-fall run Chinook salmon. (EPA letter (p. 10). We recommend that the Supplemental Draft EIS consider measures to insure freshwater flow that can meet the needs of those [declining fish] populations and ecosystem as a whole, and is supported by the best available science. | Since the time of the Draft EIR/EIS, revisions to analyses have been made in the RDEIR/SDEIS. These revisions, including those for Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources and Chapter 8, Water Quality are incorporated into this Final EIR/EIS. The EIR/EIS presents a range of conveyance facility operations for 18 action alternatives that present vary levels of Delta outflow assumptions. Conclusions for the impacts identified in the EIR/EIS are based on accepted methodologies and thresholds for determining whether an impact is adverse or significant. Please refer to Master Response 14 for information about Microcystis. |

| RECIRLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|-----------|------|---|--|
| | | <p>We recommend that this analysis recognize the demonstrated significant correlations between freshwater flow and fish species abundance." (Id.).</p> <p>The sole exceptions to the blanket denial of numerous and obvious adverse environmental impacts on water quality from the operation of the preferred Alternative 4A Water Tunnels are WQ-11 "effects on electrical conductivity concentrations resulting from facilities operations and maintenance," and WQ-32 "effects on Microcystis Bloom Formation Resulting from Facilities Operations and Maintenance." (RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A, Ch. 31, Table 31-1, pp. 31-3, 31-4). However, in the Executive Summary, even these two water quality impacts are not admitted to be adverse. (RDEIR/SDEIS Table ES-9, pp. ES-44, 45). Two tiny bits of truth survived in the Appendix but were eliminated from the Executive Summary. In any event, the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS are completely worthless in terms of providing accurate information and analyses for informed public and decision-maker review.</p> <p>Denial of the adverse impacts of taking freshwater flows away from the Delta for the Water Tunnels is absurd. Fish need water.</p> | |
| 2145 | 4 | <p>An interested person or organization, or decision-maker, has been furnished 48,000 pages of documents with central features being the false, arbitrary denial, instead of honest disclosure, of adverse environmental impacts resulting from Water Tunnels operations on Delta water quality, water quantity, fish, and fish habitat. In our previous letters to you we [Friends of the River et al.] have summarized some of the adverse impacts on these subjects either admitted in other portions of the environmental documents or pointed out by expert public agencies such as the EPA. [Footnote 3: Our previous letters referenced above include the letters of July 22, 2015 (on absence of a range of reasonable alternatives), September 9, 2015 (on Endangered Species Act violations), and October 6, 2015 (on Clean Water Act violations).]</p> | <p>The lead agencies believe that the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS are complete in their evaluation of impacts (using the best available science and modeling), direct and cumulative, that project description is complete and satisfies the requirements of NEPA, and that the project objectives are also precise and complete and satisfy the requirements of CEQA. The lead agencies believe that the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS provided the public and decision-makers with sufficient information on which to make informed comments which have been considered and incorporated into the Final EIR/EIS.</p> <p>To review the responses to comments submitted during the comment period for the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS, please refer to the index of commenters to find the appropriate letter number(s).</p> |
| 2145 | 5 | <p>CEQA defines "significant effect on the environment" to mean "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water . . . flora, fauna . . . and objects of historic or aesthetic significance." CEQA Guidelines, 14 Code Cal. Regs [Section] 15382. To anyone but a project booster, taking away substantial freshwater flows from a Delta already in crisis is an adverse change in the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.</p> | <p>For information on how the project could affect in-Delta flows, please see Chapter 6 Surface Water.</p> |
| 2145 | 6 | <p>Under CEQA, "substantial evidence" does not include: "Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, evidence which is clearly erroneous or inaccurate . . ." 14 Code Cal. Regs [Section] 15384. In addition to the false RDEIR/SDEIS findings being nothing more than conclusory argument, there have also been such findings as the truthful EPA expert determination that the Water Tunnels "would not protect beneficial uses for aquatic life, thereby violating the Clean Water Act. Total freshwater flows will likely diminish in the years ahead as a result of drought and climate change. Continued exports at today's prevailing levels would, therefore, result in even lower flows through the Delta in a likely future with less available water." (EPA Review of Draft BDCP EIS at p. 2, August 26, 2014). There is only conclusory argument, narrative, and inaccurate statements in the RDEIR/SDEIS about these impacts. There is not the supporting substantial evidence required by law.</p> | <p>The lead agencies respectfully disagree with the commenter's statement that the RDEIR/SDEIS does not provide supporting evidence required under CEQA and NEPA. The lead agencies believe that the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS are complete in their evaluation of impacts, direct and cumulative, that project description is complete and satisfies the requirements of NEPA, that the project objectives are also precise and complete and satisfy the requirements of CEQA. Substantial evidence for the conclusions reached in the EIR/EIS regarding the potential impacts are well-documented in the text of each chapter, associated appendices and provided in the reference citations. The lead agencies agree that the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS provided the public and decision-makers with sufficient information on which to make informed comments which have been considered and incorporated into the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| 2145 | 7 | <p>Under CEQA, "Decision-makers must, under the law, be presented with sufficient facts to 'evaluate the pros and cons of supplying the amount of water that the [project] will</p> | <p>Environmental effects of the proposed conveyance facility construction and operation are provided in detail in Appendix A and Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. All of these effects are also presented in this Final EIR/EIS in</p> |

| RECIRCltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | need.'" Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova, 40 Cal.4th 412, 432 (2007). Here, in violation of law, the decision-makers and also the public have been provided with claimed pros but virtually none of the cons involved in supplying the enormous amounts of water that would be diverted away from the Sacramento River and Delta. | Chapters 5 – 31, which cover all of the applicable resource areas that could be affected by the project. Where applicable, these resource chapters present adverse/significant, not adverse/less than significant and beneficial environmental effects. |
| 2145 | 8 | The NEPA Regulations provide guidance in determining whether an impact "significantly" affects the environment. "Significantly as used in NEPA requires considerations of both context and intensity . . ." 40 C.F.R. [Section] 1508.27. Considerations of context include "the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality." [Section] 1508.27(a). The Delta is recognized as being threatened by reductions in freshwater flows through the Delta. "[H]igher water exports" are among the factors the RDEIR/SDEIS admits "have stressed the natural system and led to a decline in ecological productivity." (RDEIR/SDEIS 1-10). Further, "There is an urgent need to improve the conditions for threatened and endangered fish species within the Delta." (Draft EIR/EIS ES-10; RDEIR/SDEIS ES-6). The RDEIR/SDEIS admits that "the Delta is in a state of crisis" and that "Several threatened and endangered fish species . . . have recently experienced the lowest population numbers in their recorded history." (RDEIR/SDEIS ES-1). | No response is required because no specific comment on the EIR/EIS is provided in this comment. |
| 2145 | 9 | As just two of many examples of truthful, contrary information in chapter 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, the Water Tunnels "would degrade the quantity and quality of rearing habitat for steelhead relative to Existing Conditions" and "would reduce the quantity and quality of rearing habitat for larval and juvenile green sturgeon relative to Existing Conditions." (Ch. 4, 4.3.7-22; 4.3.7-296). As just two of many examples of truthful, contrary information in chapter 5, "Effects Analysis" of the BDCP Draft Plan (December 2013), "Sacramento River attraction flows for migrating adult winter-run Chinook salmon will be lower from operations of the north Delta diversions under the BDCP" and "Plan Area flows have considerable importance for downstream migrating juvenile salmonids and will be affected by the proposed north Delta diversions . . . Because of the north Delta diversions, salmonids migrating down the Sacramento River generally will experience lower migration flows compared to existing conditions . . . As with winter-run Chinook salmon, it was assumed with high certainty that Plan area flows have critical importance for migrating juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon." (Plan, Ch. 5, 5.3-29; 5, 5.4-17). | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 2145 | 10 | Considerations of intensity refer to the "severity of impact." 40 C.F.R. [Section] 1508.27(b). Each of the ten subsections in [Section] 1508.27(b) cry out that the impacts falsely denied by the lead agencies are significant, severe, and adverse. These ten subsections are addressed as follows: "Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse . . ." [Section] 1508.27(b)(1). The claim that developing the new northern conveyance would reduce adverse impacts from the existing southern pumps on fish furnishes no excuse to evade disclosing the significant adverse impacts of the new conveyance on water quality, water quantity, and fish habitat throughout the Delta. | Comparison of conditions under the proposed project and the action alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative are presented in the EIR/EIS in Chapter 8 and associated appendices for Delta water quality; Chapter 5 and associated appendices for Delta surface water flows and elevations, SWP and CVP Delta exports, and SWP and CVP reservoir storage; and Chapter 11 for fish habitat. |
| 2145 | 11 | "The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety." [Section] 1508.27(b) (2). As shown in our [Friends of the River et al.] previous Clean Water Act (CWA)/water quality letter, the worsening of CWA violations would adversely affect public health and safety. | Public Health and Safety issues are addressed in Chapter 25, Public Health. Water quality analyses are presented in Chapter 8, Water Quality. These analyses provide specific analyses and CEQA/NEPA conclusions for these resource topics. With regards to water quality, please see Master Response 14. |

| RECIRCltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | | Public Health and Safety issues are addressed in Chapter 25, Public Health. Water quality analyses are presented in Chapter 8, Water Quality. These analyses provide specific analyses and CEQA/NEPA conclusions for these resource topics. |
| 2145 | 12 | "Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to . . . prime farmlands, wetlands . . . or ecologically critical areas." [Section] 1508.27(b)(3). The taking away of significant quantities of freshwater flows upstream from the Delta would pull in greater salinity from San Francisco Bay, adversely impacting the prime farmlands of the Delta. The Delta consists of designated critical habitats for no fewer than five endangered and threatened fish species. California has determined by law that the Delta is "in crisis . . ." Water Code, [Section] 85001(a). | The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS. The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS. Where significant impacts to uses would occur due to the alternative, as opposed to other forces including climate change and sea level rise, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided. With regards to water quality, please see Master Response 14. |
| 2145 | 13 | "The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial." [Section] 1508.27(b)(4). The Water Tunnels are the most controversial public works project in California history. This project in its previous form as the "peripheral canal" was voted down by a statewide referendum in June 1982. One reason the lead agencies falsely deny obvious adverse environmental impacts, hide alternatives increasing flows by reducing exports, and refuse to post contrary information and views from the public and other public agencies on the BDCP/Water Fix website is because this project is so controversial. "The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks." [Section] 1508.27(b)(5). The experts, for example, of the Delta Independent Science Board have commented on the degree of uncertainty in the environmental documents. (DISB comment letter, September 30, 2015). | Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The documentation generated by this project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes. Refer to Master Response 41 for additional information on Transparency. Resource areas are addressed separately in the EIR/EIS under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments and mitigation measures will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. In cases where it is not possible to offset those significant impacts (see Chapter 31, Other CEQA/NEPA Required Sections for a complete list of significant and unavoidable impacts), that information will be provided in the Statement of Overriding Considerations and will be considered by the decision makers with each lead agency to determine if the project should be approved or not. For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546 |
| 2145 | 14 | "The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration." [Section] 1508.27(b)(6). Whether the Delta Tunnels are approved will in significant part determine future Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP) operations. The action also represents a decision in principle that flows through the Delta will not be increased by reducing exports. Billions of dollars would not be spent to build the Water Tunnels unless the intent is to use them for the purpose for which they are intended. "Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts . . ." [Section] 1508.27(b)(7). The Water Tunnels impacts must be considered together with impacts resulting from future CVP and SWP operations. | The EIR/S has included the effects of the past, present (and ongoing programs/projects) and reasonably foreseeable projects in the analysis which is consistent with both CEQA and NEPA. This includes the CVP and SWP operations. Reasonably foreseeable future actions are addressed in Section 5, Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses in the 2015 RDEIR/SEIS. |
| 2145 | 15 | "The degree to which the action . . . may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific . . . resources." [Section] 1508.27(b)(8). Endangered species are addressed in the next paragraph. One does not know ahead of time what species may contain the key to a | The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act as well as federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|---|
| | | <p>cure for a disease.</p> <p>"The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act [ESA] of 1973." [Section] 1508.27(b)(9). In Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova, 40 Cal. 412, 449 (2007), the California Supreme Court determined that "We do not consider this response [similar to the denials of the obvious here] substantial evidence that the loss of stream flows would have no substantial effect on salmon migration. Especially given the sensitivity and listed status of the resident salmon species, the County's failure to address loss of Cosumnes River stream flows in the Draft EIR 'deprived the public . . . of meaningful participation [citation omitted] in the CEQA discussion.'" [Footnote 4: The Court noted that a "potential substantial impact on endangered, rare or threatened species is per se significant." 40 Cal.4th at 449 citing Guidelines section 14 Code Cal. Regs [Section] 15065(a.)] The Court required recirculation of the Draft EIR. We [Friends of the River et al.] have summarized in our earlier ESA and CWA [Clean Water Act] letters some of the impacts Water Tunnels operations would have on at least five endangered or threatened fish species and their designated critical habitats. The conclusions are contradicted by other portions of the BDCP/WaterFix documents. Of course these impacts are significant adverse impacts. Yet the Executive Summary falsely concludes in all cases that they are not. (RDEIR/SDEIS Table ES-9, pp. ES-47 through 60, Aqua-NAA-1 through 16, Aqua-1 through 217). Until about April 2015, the claim being made in the Draft EIR/EIS had been that while there would be adverse impacts of Water Tunnels operations on the fish and their habitat, some of that would be mitigated by the provision of wetland restoration. Now however, the "65,000 acres of tidal wetland restoration" has been eviscerated down to "59 acres." (RDEIR/SDEIS p. ES-17). Yet impacts previously either determined to be adverse or undetermined are now determined to not be significant or adverse. With the National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service no longer being co-lead agencies, Reclamation and DWR have been freer to evade the law and the truth in the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>"Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment." [Section] 1508.27(b)(10). As shown in our previous letters, the action threatens violation of several laws imposed for protection of the environment including the ESA, CWA, and the Delta Reform Act.</p> | <p>volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The EIR/S process did not evade the law. US Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service will be required to issue take authorizations under the Endangered Species Act prior to the project being constructed. If take authorization is not granted, as well as the issuance of a Section 404 permit under the Clean Water Act, the project will not proceed.</p> |
| 2145 | 16 | <p>We [Friends of the River et al.] understand that the exporters want to take the water away from the Delta and that their submissive agencies, Reclamation and DWR, want to give them the water. But these desires afford no license to churn out Draft environmental documents under NEPA and CEQA that falsely deny instead of truthfully disclose the numerous adverse impacts that diversion of water for the Water Tunnels would have on Delta water quality, water quantity, endangered and threatened fish species, designated critical habitat, and public health.</p> | <p>Reclamation and DWR have used the best available science to prepare the environmental analyses. The commenter does not identify any specific instances demonstrating how the document has failed to disclose adverse water quality, water quantity, endangered and threatened fish species, designated critical habitat and public health impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> |
| 2145 | 17 | <p>The NEPA Regulations require that: "The draft statement must fulfill and satisfy to the fullest extent possible the requirements established for final statements in section 102(2)(C) of the Act. If a draft statement is so inadequate as to preclude meaningful analysis, the agency shall prepare and circulate a revised draft of the appropriate portion. . ." 40 C.F.R. [Section] 1502.9(a).</p> <p>The Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS with their arbitrary, false denials of numerous adverse environmental impacts resulting from Water Tunnels operations on the Delta</p> | <p>The Draft EIR/EIS contains a wealth of information and analyses. The document reflects seven years of collaboration, response to requests for additional information, careful thought, accumulation of the latest scientific information, and the thorough analyses needed to develop and conduct an environmental review of a project such as the proposed project.</p> <p>In 2010, the first administrative draft of the BDCP was released to the public. In 2012, the second administrative draft BDCP and the first administrative draft of the EIR/EIS were released to the public. The second administrative draft of the EIR/EIS was released to the public in the spring of 2013. Prior to the</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|---|
| | | are so inadequate as to preclude meaningful analysis. To comply with NEPA the lead agencies must either drop the Water Tunnels project or prepare and circulate a revised, honest Draft of the impacts analysis portions of the documents as well as the alternatives portions. | <p>December 2013 release of the public review Draft EIR/EIS, the proposed project was significantly revised in response to stakeholder involvement and engineering optimization efforts. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The official public review process for the Draft BDCP, 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS provided an opportunity for formal public comment on the proposed project and project alternatives. Public and agency comments on the public draft will likely lead to further refinement of the proposed project.</p> <p>The Federal and State Lead Agencies have done their best to make the EIR/EIS for the proposed project as fair, objective, and complete as possible and believe that it satisfies the requirements of CEQA and NEPA.</p> |
| 2145 | 18 | <p>The CEQA Guidelines require that:</p> <p>“Significant new information’ requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:</p> <p>(1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.</p> <p>(2) . . .</p> <p>(3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.</p> <p>(4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. 14 Code Cal. Regs [Section] 15088.5(a)(1), (3), and (4).”</p> <p>CEQA requires that unless the Water Tunnels project is dropped, a new Draft EIR/EIS sufficient to provide for meaningful public review and comment must be prepared and circulated.</p> | <p>The RDEIR/SDEIS presents new information and environmental analysis for modification of Alternative 4 and addition of new Alternatives 4A, 2D and 5A as well as revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS deemed necessary to recirculate. The RDEIR/SDEIS is a partial recirculation of the Draft EIR and a supplemental EIS to publicly disclose significant new information related to the project and its alternatives. Much of the RDEIR/SDEIS contents are also republished in this Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| 2145 | 19 | <p>Extinction is forever. Environmental full disclosure is imperative here. Arbitrary false denials of adverse environmental impacts resulting from new upstream diversion of large quantities of freshwater flows from a Delta already in crisis and from listed fish species and their designated critical habitats are unacceptable. The lead agencies must either drop the Water Tunnels project or provide an informative and honest Draft EIS/EIR that will afford a basis for meaningful public review and comment.</p> | <p>See Response to Comment 2145-17.</p> |
| 2146 | 1 | <p>The San Joaquin County Mosquito and Vector Control District (District) has reviewed the BDCP as presented. The restoration of the Delta ecosystem must include implementation of best management practices (BMPs) for mosquito prevention and control. BMPs are necessary to implement during the design phase for these types of proposals. We can provide historical information on mosquito species and mosquito-borne virus prevalence associated with current habitat located in the Delta ecosystem. Our District conducts a comprehensive mosquito control program in the San Joaquin County Delta. This work includes mosquito/virus surveillance, ground and aerial mosquito larvicide treatments and ground/aerial adult mosquito control treatments. We prefer a proactive approach to mosquito control; whereby, through proper design and</p> | <p>Certain features of the proposed project (e.g., cofferdams at the intake sites, sedimentation basins, solids lagoons, and the intermediate forebay inundation area) have the potential to provide mosquito breeding habitat.</p> <p>The depth, design, and operation of the sedimentation basins and solids lagoons would prevent the development of suitable mosquito habitat primarily due to their depth (23 feet and 15 feet, respectively), and because the water contained in these structures would be constantly circulated and the flow rates would be high enough to prevent water from stagnating. Additionally, the lead agencies will consult with the appropriate mosquito vector control district(s) prior to construction of the intakes and before the sedimentation basins, solids lagoons and the intermediate forebay inundation area become operational to inform mosquito management and control practices in order to limit public health risks from</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | <p>management techniques, mosquito prevention is key.</p> <p>One way to ensure these factors are part of the design phase is to follow at least two examples of BMPs to ensure mosquito prevention. Two BMPs (attached) that address these types of projects include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control in California - Recommendations for California Department of Public Health and the Mosquito Vector Control Association of California. 2. Central Valley Joint Venture Technical Guide to Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control in Managed Wetlands - Developed in conjunction with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Mosquito and Vector Control Districts. 3. Integrated Pest Management Plan for Certain Vectors in San Joaquin County, CA 2008 - Should be added to the list of published guidelines. | <p>mosquito-borne diseases. Further, once the sedimentation basins, solids lagoons and intermediate forebay inundation area become operational, Lead Agencies will again consult with the mosquito vector control districts to determine if mosquitoes are present in these conveyance components. If mosquitos are present, mosquito control techniques will be implemented.</p> <p>To aid in vector management and control, the construction contractors will be required to develop an integrated pest management plan (IMM Plan) and consult with appropriate Mosquito and Vector Control Districts (MVCDs) with respect to restoration and conservation activities. Consultation will include, but not be limited to: review of the IMM Plan and best management practices (BMPs) to be implemented at the restoration sites and review of proposed mosquito monitoring efforts at restoration sites and assistance with monitoring efforts where feasible. The Central Valley Joint Venture’s Technical guide to Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control in Managed Wetlands (Kwasny et al. 2004) and other guidelines will be used to help design appropriate restoration and conservation features to the extent feasible consistent with the biological goals and objectives of the proposed project. The IMM Plan will address wetland design considerations, water management practices, vegetation management, biological controls, and wetland maintenance. Additional detail on these BMPs is included in Chapter 25 and Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, of the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. In particular, see the commitment entitled “Prepare and Implement Mosquito Management Plans.”</p> <p>In Chapter 25 of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, the impact analysis for Impact PH-1 (“Increase in Vector-Borne Diseases as a Result of Construction and Operation of the Intakes, Solids Lagoons, and/or Sedimentation Basins Associated with the Water Conveyance Facilities”) has been revised to include discussion of the expansion of Clifton Court Forebay.</p> |
| 2146 | 2 | <p>San Joaquin County MVCD [Mosquito and Vector Control District] concerns include the habitat creation adjacent to existing development. The District must ensure any new habitat design, especially one that includes wetland habitat, follows the BMPs [best management practices] in order to prevent mosquito breeding. These winged insects do not remain at their point of origin; rather they will migrate toward a food source. Currently, should the residents of these areas experience a mosquito migration origination from the adjacent agricultural land, the Districts will respond by confirming the mosquito breeding site and abate as necessary in order to relieve the residents from the mosquito activity. This past year, the Districts conducted a number of both ground and aerial adult mosquito control applications to control West Nile virus-carrying mosquitoes. We cannot have development of a site (conductive to mosquito breeding), that has great potential to create a public health risk to current residents adjacent to proposed sites for planned habitat restoration.</p> <p>A significant portion of the Plan is dedicated to restoration of wetland ecosystems and the development of migratory bird habitat. If not properly designed, built, managed and maintained, these types of aquatic features provide extensive mosquito-breeding habitat that requires responses and resources from the San Joaquin County Mosquito and Vector Control District.</p> | <p>See response to comment 2146-1.</p> |
| 2146 | 3 | <p>To interrupt mosquito breeding cycles and West Nile virus transmission, the District [San Joaquin County Mosquito and Vector Control District] can sometimes provide short-term control of immature and adult mosquitoes through applications of pesticides. For long term control, the District works with landowners and water managers to modify mosquito-breeding conditions to prevent or reduce the</p> | <p>Revisions have been made to Final EIR/EIS Chapter 25, Section 25.1.1.5, based on comments from the San Joaquin Mosquito and Vector Control District. See response to comment 2146.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 25, to reduce potential impacts on public health due to vector-borne diseases as a result of constructing and operating the water conveyance facilities and habitat restoration and enhancement, DWR would consult and coordinate with San Joaquin County and Sacramento-Yolo County</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|---|
| | | <p>reoccurrence of mosquito development.</p> <p>The California Health and Safety Code authorizes mosquito control districts to conduct surveillance and control of mosquitoes, prevent the reoccurrence of mosquitoes, and legally abate the production of mosquitoes or public nuisance, defined as "Any activity that supports the development, attraction, or harborage of vectors, or that facilitates the introduction or spread of vectors." Landowners, both public and private, are subject to civil penalties of \$1,000 per day plus cost associated with control of the mosquitoes.</p> <p>We have updated section 25.1.15 Vectors of the BDCPlan. The updated information provided by the District must be included, since it is more representative of the geographic project site. The comments relative to the individual subsections is attached.</p> <p>To reduce the impacts to public health and the effects on public services, and to promote cooperative relationships between local government and public and private landowners, the District recommends that property owners implement mosquito prevention best management practices (BMPs) on lands developed for wetlands, ecosystem restoration projects, migratory bird habitat, and other manmade aquatic features.</p> <p>This District, in conjunction with Contra Costa County MVCD, Sacramento/Yolo MVCD and Solano County MAD worked with the Delta Protection Commission [DPC] to develop recommendations on mosquito prevention strategies for wetlands and land flooding. The recommendations were developed to reduce mosquito populations, reduce the amount of pesticides applied to the environment, limit landowner liability, and lessen the impact on public services. Policy 10 (P-10) of the Natural Resources Section of DPC's Land Use and Resource Management Plan states: "Ensure that design, construction, and management of any flooding program to provide seasonal wildlife and aquatic habitat on agricultural lands, duck club lands and additional seasonal and tidal wetlands, shall incorporate "best management practices" to minimize vectors including mosquito-breeding opportunities, and shall be coordinated with local vector control districts, (each of the four vector control districts in the Delta provides specific wetland/mosquito criteria to landowners within their district)."</p> <p>In conclusion, the San Joaquin County Mosquito and Vector Control District recommends that the EIR include the impacts to public health and the effects on public services we feel will result with the implementation of the plan.</p> | <p>MVCDs and prepare and implement mosquito management plans (Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs). Best management practices to be implemented as part of the mosquito management plans would help control mosquitoes and would be consistent with practices presented in CDPH's Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control in California (California Department of Public Health 2012). In addition, DWR would follow guidelines provided in the Central Valley Joint Venture's Technical Guide to Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control in Managed Wetlands in the development and implementation of these best management practices. Implementation of these best management practices would reduce the likelihood that BDCP operations would require an increase in abatement activities by the local MVCDs.</p> <p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A, under which substantially fewer acres of habitat would be restored/enhanced relative to Alternative 4. Alternative 4A Environmental Commitments 3, 4, and 7-10 would restore up to 15,836 acres vs. 83,800 acres under Alternative 4. Therefore, the potential for vector-borne disease effects under Alternative 4A would likely be substantially less than the potential associated with Alternative 4.</p> |
| 2146 | 4 | <p>The BDCP project is primarily in the Delta region of San Joaquin County, under vector control jurisdiction of San Joaquin County Mosquito & Vector Control District (SJCMVCD). The Delta region is one of the major sources of vector populations and active enzootic West Nile virus transmission. SJCMVCD has all the first-hand data, knowledge, technique and experience in managing vector population and monitoring West Nile virus activities in the Delta.</p> <p>Unfortunately, these were not mentioned or referenced, and some of the data sources cited are irrelevant to the study area. In addition, some of the facts need to be double-checked and corrected accordingly.</p> <p>Page 25-7, Line 13-20:</p> <p>Please refer to the following document for the latest update of Aedes aegypti and</p> | <p>Regarding comment on Aedes aegypti and albopictus detection in California, California Department of Public Health is cited.</p> <p>Regarding comments on breeding habitat, it is noted in Ch. 25, Section 25.3.1.1 (Vectors) that most species of mosquitoes lay eggs on the surface of stagnant water, but that some species lay eggs on damp soil. See also responses to comment 2146-1 and 2146-3.</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | <p>albopictus detection in California.</p> <p>https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Healthinfo/discond/Documents/AedesDistributionMap.pdf</p> <p>Page 25-7, Line 34:</p> <p>This is for Aedes and Psorophora mosquito species. Culex or Culiseta mosquito species prefer stagnant surface water.</p> <p>Page 25-8, Line 1:</p> <p>Anopheles, Culex and Culiseta mosquito species lay eggs on water surface. Aedes and Psorophora mosquitoes lay eggs on soil or substrate that are subject to future inundation.</p> | |
| 2146 | 5 | <p>Page 25-8, Line 6-7:</p> <p>As pointed out in the first paragraph, agricultural practice and landscaping has strong impact on mosquito breeding. In Delta, mosquito abundance is basically determined by agricultural factors. Dry period does not mean reduced mosquito abundance in Delta. This year Delta has much higher vector population although it is very dry year.</p> | <p>Please see Chapter 25 of the Final EIR/EIS for more information on vectors and public health. See also responses to comments 2146-1, 2146-3 and 2146-4.</p> |
| 2146 | 6 | <p>Page 25-8, Line 34-35:</p> <p>Add ", and mosquito-borne disease activities."</p> <p>Page 25-10, Table 25-5:</p> <p>In Delta, the most abundant mosquito species are Aedes melanimon, Aedes vexans, Culex erythrothorax, Culex pipiens, Culex tarsalis, Culiseta incidens and Culiseta inornata.</p> <p>Aedes nigromaculis and Aedes sierrensis are slightly abundant.</p> <p>Aedes dorsalis, Aedes washinoi, Anopheles franciscanus, Anopheles freeborni, Anopheles punctipennis and Culiseta particeps are present, but very rare.</p> <p>We never collected Aedes squamiger in the past 10 years in Delta. Aedes squamiger is a salt marsh mosquito species closely associated with tidal and reclaimed marshes of the Pacific coast. It does not occur in the vicinity of Delta.</p> | <p>Information in Table 25-5 in Chapter 25 of the Final EIR/EIS was sourced from the following and the information was considered accurate and relatively up-to-date at the time the analysis in Chapter 25 was written. Table 25-5 was not intended to provide relative information on mosquito species abundance. Aedes squamiger was not included in Table 25-5.</p> <p>Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District 2008.</p> <p>Solano County Mosquito Abatement District 2005a; Napa County Mosquito Abatement District 2006.</p> <p>Alameda County Mosquito Abatement District 2011.</p> <p>Solano County Mosquito Abatement District 2005b.</p> <p>Santa Cruz County Government Environmental Health Services 2011.</p> <p>Marin/Sonoma Mosquito and Vector Control District 2009; Solano County Mosquito Abatement District 2005a.</p> <p>Text in Draft EIR/EIS Section 25.1.1.5 was revised to indicate that a discussion of mosquito-borne diseases was included.</p> |
| 2146 | 7 | <p>Page 25-12, Table 25-6:</p> <p>1. All the information needed in this table can be found in this single document:</p> <p>https://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/occupations/Documents/ManualBiologyandControlofMosquitoesinCA.pdf</p> <p>Diseases and their vectors can be found in page 19-24, mosquito migration distance can be found 33-51.</p> | <p>Final EIR/EIS Chapter 25 Tables 25-7 and 25-8 have been updated to include data from last five years (2011-2015) pertaining to confirmed West Nile virus cases in California, and West Nile virus activity by county in the study area, respectively.</p> <p>Formal scientific names for each mosquito species were added in the Final EIR/EIS Chapter 25, Public Health.</p> <p>The sentence, "Therefore, while WNV is a concern and a potential threat to the study area and California, the documented human occurrences have been relatively limited.", referred to by the commenter, has been revised to indicate that West Nile virus is a growing concern and that the documented human occurrences within the study area have been relatively limited.</p> |

| RECIRCltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|---|
| | | <p>2. Formal scientific names are recommended for each mosquito species. Common names often create confusion for readers outside of the field.</p> <p>Page 25-14, Line 10-14, Table 25-7 and 25-8:</p> <p>West Nile virus transmission is dynamic. It has a unique pattern with transmission risk to human fluctuating between normal and epidemic levels. Data from last five years (2011-2015) should be cited in table 25-7 and 25-8 to reflect the actual trend of West Nile virus transmission. As a matter of fact, California experienced the worst WNV outbreak in 2014 since 2005. Similarly, in 2014 we observed the highest WNV infection rate in mosquitoes in Delta area. In Delta counties, there were more than 500 positive birds in 2014. Although the total documented human cases in Delta counties in the last 5 years are not substantial, the undocumented human cases are estimated to be more than documented cases. This has been the trend in the last 5 years because physicians usually do not order WNV testing which is not covered by most insurance. Furthermore, we are still under risk of WNV outbreak in Delta Counties if favorable conditions meet. This can be exemplified by Orange County and Butte County. Both counties had relatively low human cases in the past 5 years, but Orange County had major outbreak in 2014 with 263 documented cases, and Butte County is having an outbreak this year with 38 cases so far. WNV is here to stay. It is an existing threat and we are under risk. Therefore, the statement "Therefore, while WNV is a concern and a potential threat to the study area and California, the documented human occurrences have been relatively limited." is inaccurate.</p> <p>All the data needed for 2011-2015 are available on http://www.westnile.ca.gov/</p> | |
| 2147 | 1 | <p>Why don't you wait until it rains and collect more water first before building more damaging tunnels? Another idea is to stop the overdevelopment of this state. If not then there is no end for the water demand no matter what you do.</p> | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p> |
| 2147 | 2 | <p>Be responsible for plants and animals as well as the people who have lost touch with nature.</p> | <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect fish. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect plants and animals. Both chapters describe the impacts, both negative and positive, and discuss the mitigation measures and avoidance and minimization measures proposed to avoid, minimize, and compensate for any significant impacts.</p> |
| 2148 | 1 | <p>Does it take into account the likelihood that natural flows of water into the Delta will decrease in coming decades because of climate change? The freshwater in the Delta originates as snowfall in California's mountains, and we've already seen those trending lower and lower. Spending huge amounts of money to divert water away from the</p> | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|---|
| | | Delta is crazy, in that context. | <p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The Proposed Alternatives that include BDCP take into account the expected decrease in flows in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers in the future as a result of climate change. The assumptions of climate change and its effects on the hydrology of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta are described in the 2013 Draft BDCP Chapter 5.2.4, How Climate Change was Incorporated into the Analysis. These climate change projections included assumptions that snowpack in the Sierra Nevada and Cascade Ranges would be diminished over time as a result of warmer winters on average.</p> |
| 2149 | 1 | Don't waste our money fooling with Mother Nature. It will just make things worse! | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p> |
| 2151 | 1 | My opinion has changed, and I now think the private parties that wanted to help fund this were doing so far too much for their advantage while willing to inflict unacceptable consequences on the public. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> |
| 2152 | 1 | The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta. It is the brainchild of those who will profit from just one more big project whose only true function will be to enrich the developers. If you have not read Cadillac Desert you should do so immediately. Our history is rich with stories of developers become very wealthy without actually solving our problems with water.No more big projects. They promise a lot, deliver little, and make the developers very wealthy. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 45 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> |
| 2153 | 1 | Northern California is suffering wildfires, and you're trying to do this now? People are dying because of your poor planning. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | | <p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> |
| 2154 | 1 | We have precious little wetland habitat left in California and dwindling protected natural spaces. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p> |
| 2154 | 2 | The solution to California's water problems need to [be] future-proof and drought-proof. Taking more water out of already strained watersheds and building more water storage is not the solution. Invest in infrastructure that provides water in times of drought such as fog fences, solar desalinization, urban cisterns, and runoff control. | <p>Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p> |
| 2155 | 1 | California's water problems cannot be solved by moving water around; they have to be solved by conservation and thinking about water in new ways. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations. As described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, it is anticipated that climate change would result in more frequent and more severe rainfall events and less snowfall than under historic conditions. These rainfall events would result in periods of time when the capacity of the existing intakes would not be adequate. Therefore, the proposed project would provide the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods. The north Delta and south Delta intakes would only be used to divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements.</p> <p>The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling,</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | | desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). |
| 2155 | 2 | Water isn't just for humans; delta species and delta land need water too. With the massive flooding predicted for this winter, please don't commit our resources to destruction. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. |
| 2156 | 1 | Too much water has [been] and is being diverted from the Delta, resulting in land subsidence, damage to listed species, and loss of critical habitat. San Francisco Bay has experienced a state of artificial drought for the last 15 years. We cannot afford to invest more money in shipping water out of the Delta. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 26 for additional information on effects on northern California.</p> |
| 2157 | 1 | Diverting water away from the Delta will take needed water away from fish, birds and other wildlife. | <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p> |
| 2157 | 2 | It [California WaterFix] will cause the destruction of the estuary without creating any new water for users. When the effects of climate change bring about higher temperatures and diminished snowpack, there will be less water in the Sacramento River to export at a time when more water will be needed to preserve salmon habitat and Delta water quality. | <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).</p> <p>As described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, it is anticipated that climate change would result in more frequent and more severe rainfall events and less snowfall than under historic conditions. These rainfall events would result in periods of time when the capacity of the existing intakes would not be adequate. Therefore, the proposed project would provide the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months;</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|---|
| | | | <p>and increase flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods.</p> <p>The proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> |
| 2157 | 3 | Depriving the Delta of flows through a diversion point on the Sacramento River will destroy the Delta habitat and economy. | <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p> |
| 2157 | 4 | The tunnels plan will deplete the water needed by the whole surrounding region in Northern California. We who live in this area cannot afford to stand by and accept this extremely destructive and expensive plan! There are better alternatives which will be more compatible with the conditions caused by climate change, and which could better preserve the Delta and the precious water which sustains life there and in the surrounding area. | <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need).</p> |
| 2158 | 1 | Sucking water from the Delta is not a "fix." It is an effort in futility that will only lead to greater problems. If you are going to build tunnels, what about tunnels from the Midwest, north, and South that have more than an abundance of water that only causes hardships? | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p> |
| 2159 | 1 | The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta. Not to mention the loss of huge amounts of farming land, which, by the way, feeds Southern Californians! | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Loss of Delta agricultural land from construction of the conveyance facilities is presented in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. While considerable agricultural land would be converted under Alternative 4A, Mitigation Measure AG-1 is provided to reduce effect on agricultural operations as much as possible. Alternative 4A, also substantially reduced effects on agricultural resources compared to other</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | | alternatives presented in the EIR/EIS. |
| 2160 | 1 | The tunnels will paradoxically deplete the Delta of precious water by changing flows, but will not create any new water for users. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p> |
| 2160 | 2 | The loss of the largest estuary on the West Coast of North America is not worth a pair of new tunnels. | The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act as well as federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 2161 | 1 | This destruction [of the Delta] will lead to unintended consequences that could easily worsen California's water problems. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> |
| 2161 | 2 | The funds would be better spent developing water recycling in communities throughout California. | <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> |
| 2162 | 1 | The tunnels project will have long term impacts to the towns along the river who have made their livelihoods for generations from the Delta. | This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | | <p>Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please refer to master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. Chapter 16 describes impacts to the local economy, population and housing, and community character under Impacts ECON-1, 2, and 3.</p> |
| 2164 | 1 | We know and you know that the tunnels are a political fix, not a water fix for the state. No tunnels! | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. |
| 2165 | 1 | Travelling to Los Angeles and the San Fernando Valley this summer, I saw more green lawns than brown ones. Southern California needs to first reduce its frivolous water use before it draws upon Northern California's supply. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.</p> |
| 2166 | 1 | Require the implementation of more extreme water conservation measures for crops and industry! | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 3.</p> |
| 2167 | 1 | This whole tunnel thing is ridiculous and unnecessary. People need to conserve more and agriculture needs to learn to water with water-saving ideas. And we all need to start collecting rainwater, the people and the towns and cities and the farmers. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p> |
| 2168 | 1 | <p>The California WaterFix is yet another water grab for Southern California at the expense of natural habitat and environmental health elsewhere. Diverting water from the Sacramento will lead to the destruction of the Sacramento River Delta.</p> <p>Bay Area residents who travel to the Los Angeles area are just as appalled today as we were three decades ago at the wasteful practices of residents of that area. Southern California needs to learn to use water-saving measures.</p> | <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | Please stop the California WaterFix. | The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances. |
| 2169 | 1 | Please do not put [money] into this project. It will not create more water; it will redistribute water to places that should discontinue growth. Developing areas that do not have sufficient water resources should not be enabled. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>DWR’s fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p> |
| 2170 | 1 | Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta. Use conservation and proper ecological methods to make best use of the state's water. Perhaps Southern California should learn how to live in a desert climate! | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California’s water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>DWR’s fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|---|
| | | | <p>For information regarding the beneficial uses of water please see Master Response 34.</p> <p>Although Alternatives 4A (“WaterFix”), 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state’s long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. These habitat restoration actions will be implemented faster and more reliably by separating them from the water conveyance facility implementation.</p> |
| 2171 | 1 | What Southern California needs is to learn how to conserve water even in times of plenty, to learn how not to waste water, and to stop welcoming hordes of new residents. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California’s water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> |
| 2172 | 1 | You, Governor Brown, know we need to be looking at ways of living within our means and not extending ecosystems so far beyond their natural capability. I agree that the San Joaquin pumps are devastating but so is opening the flood gates to allow yet more water to be relocated to arid/desert areas. Pumping more water away from the Delta and destroying that vital ecosystem is not the solution that's needed. If cities can't support themselves on the amount of water they currently have, then populations need to be relocated, not resources. | <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR’s fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project, Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 6 regarding demand management, and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p> |
| 2173 | 1 | We don't need tunnels. What we need to do is stop subsidizing water for animal agriculture and the crops they feed on and we need to stop the constant building of new housing developments and golf courses/parks that go along with them. Any costly fixes you come up with will be nullified by new development and thereby a waste of our | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|---|
| | | money. | to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment raises import policy issues concerning sustainable growth, water supplies in California. However, the comment does not question the growth inducement analysis or conclusions of Chapter 30. |
| 2174 | 1 | We do not want, need, nor can we afford more mega-infrastructure boondoggles. We have too many already. The California water crisis is multifaceted and requires a multifaceted set of solutions. Firstly, bringing to the table and empowering all stakeholders including those [who] are dependent on thriving ecosystem(s). We then need to set comprehensive long-term goals and policies that will bring us ever closer to a flexible, secure and sustainable future. By definition, to be sustainable our policies and systems need to be locally oriented, resilient and provide adequately for the needs of all. | This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Please see Master Response 5 for comments pertaining to funding and Master Response 3 pertaining to the purpose and need for the proposed project. Please refer to Chapter 32 of the Final EIR/EIS and Master Response 64 for information regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP). More information on how DWR has developed the project in an open and transparent manner is provided in Master Response 41. |
| 2175 | 1 | Our climate, hot and dry, is ideally suited for other water recovery technologies such as solar/condensation. Other jurisdictions have remarkable water reclamation and conservation infrastructures in place, such as Israel. Desalination technologies are proven and cost-effective. | This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. |
| 2175 | 2 | There are too many species that are threatened by this plan, not to mention the unique nature preserve represented by the Delta. I am also opposed, in fact and in principle, to any proposal that bypasses safeguards to existing ecosystems. We as a species are not knowledgeable enough to foresee the unintended consequences of this significant change to this beloved estuary. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. |
| 2176 | 1 | This is nothing more than a huge environmental disaster that we cannot take back. This boondoggle will be your and Governor Brown's legacy of ecosystem meddling beyond compare. Don't do this to our precious Delta and wildlife. Think about the future. | This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. |
| 2177 | 1 | In the frenzy surrounding the current interest in supporting more connections between the big metropolises please try to look at all sides of such a project. Short-sightedness | This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|---|
| | | need not be the norm for construction. | index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. |
| 2178 | 1 | The cost is obscene and does nothing to provide adequate water statewide. That money would be better spent on facilities that desalinate seawater and actually increase the total amount of fresh water available for agriculture and consumption. Do not support those stupid tunnels. | This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5. For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. |
| 2179 | 1 | The tunnels will not create any new water and will use up funds that are needed for habitat conservation and for funding projects to improve independence locally. This is wasteful and a really, really bad idea. | This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. |
| 2180 | 1 | This never was about protecting the Delta. That was just a ruse to push through a project to move as much high-quality water south at the expense of the Delta and San Francisco Bay. In fact, the California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta. | This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. |
| 2181 | 1 | Please do not approve the plan to build tunnels under the San Francisco Bay Delta to move more water to Southern California. The tunnels represent a 20th century model of delivering water that won't work in the climate change-challenged present. Increasing temperatures will dramatically alter flow patterns as diminished snowpack becomes the new normal. Less water will be available for export at the same time that more water must be held to preserve salmon habitat and Delta water quality. Increased reliance on Delta exports that will not be available | This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The anticipated hydrologic changes due to climate change (increased temperatures and more years of critical dryness, increased water temperatures, changes in precipitation and runoff patterns, sea level rise, and tidal variations) will constrain and challenge future water management practices across the state, with |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | run contrary to preserving the ecosystem. | <p>or without the proposed project. The state is addressing climate change through strategies and a decision-making framework as outlined in the California Climate Adaptation Strategy and Adaptation Planning Guide. However, no single project and indeed none of the project alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>The State of California has acknowledged that sea level rise threatens coastal and near coastal resources (such as the Delta and Delta water supplies) and that adaptation and resiliency planning to protect these resources from expected levels of sea level rise is appropriate. (OPC, 2013) http://www.opc.ca.gov/2013/04/update-to-the-sea-level-rise-guidance-document/</p> <p>(CCC, 2013) http://www.coastal.ca.gov/climate/SLRguidance.html</p> <p>EO S-3-05. http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=1861</p> <p>EO S-13-08 http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=11036</p> <p>AB 32 also mentions SLR as a threat to California.</p> <p>California Waterfix would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational scenarios, measures focused on the protection, restoration, and enhancement of the Delta ecosystem and measures to reduce other stressors (Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, California Waterfix would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. By improving and expanding available habitat, the proposed project would increase resilience and adaptability to climate change by making alternative habitat available during periods of high stress, such as very high or low freshwater inflow or very high salinity intrusion.</p> <p>Multiple analyses were performed in the proposed project to test the robustness of the alternatives to a range of potential future conditions. Water supply, aquatic and terrestrial resources were all analyzed with projected future conditions. The proposed project will likely remain in place and functional far into the future when salinity intrusion may require less frequent use of the south Delta pumps. Far from being stranded assets, the tunnels will be part of the state's strategy in adapting to climate change.</p> <p>More information on ways in which the BDCP/California WaterFix proposes to improve resiliency and adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, EIR/EIS and Appendix A RDEIR/SDEIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS (in appendix A).</p> |
| 2182 | 1 | Please leave the Delta. Don't listen to the whining farmers in the Central Valley (I live near Fresno). Many have sold off their existing water rights and want new "free" Delta water now. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See</p> |

| RECIRCltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|--|
| | | | Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water). |
| 2183 | 1 | Please stop the destruction of the San Francisco Bay Delta -- please stop the same tired, old, and outdated plans that take even more of the severely depleted northern water resources for powerful agriculture/water interests in the south -- please stop the Jerry Brown WaterFix. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> |
| 2184 | 1 | <p>We have little evidence that the tunnels will preserve water that Californians need to drink. And more attention to smaller, efficient water preservation methods will be better than this massive project depleting the Delta.</p> <p>California needs many projects to protect people's drinking water and natural habitat. They must be regional and local.</p> | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is not a water preservation or storage measure. Rather, it is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p> |
| 2185 | 1 | Our Governor seems to develop a tin ear from time to time in regards to the environment. His greenlight to fracking is one example. WaterFix is another. Dumb! Have him cancel fracking and use that water to supply the places WaterFix is supposed to. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking - or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water, and is a lawful use of water. Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|---|---|
| | | | Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by proposed water conveyance facilities. |
| 2186 | 1 | Short-sighted solutions like this will only serve to kick the can down the road. Invest that money in water infrastructure and rebate programs to encourage Californians to purchase water-saving technologies. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state’s long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California’s water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p> |
| 2187 | 1 | <p>The tunnels project would siphon away vast quantities of local funds that should instead go towards building self-reliance in Southern California and the South Bay Area and water conservation and groundwater recharge in the San Joaquin Valley.</p> <p>I seriously question what water would be available to send through the tunnels if best science-based climate change scenarios come to pass.</p> | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California’s water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility. In addition to the added water</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|---|
| | | | <p>management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 31 (Compliance with Applicable Delta Reform Act Requirements, Issue 2, Climate Change) for a listing of the numerous chapters and appendices in the RDEIR/SDEIS that address and demonstrate the importance of climate change in the evaluation of the proposed project's alternatives, Master Response 35 and Master Response 19 (Climate Change) for additional information regarding water supply and climate change.</p> |
| 2188 | 1 | <p>This plan is environmentally destructive and short-sighted. Removing the largest estuary lays the groundwork for the loss of an ecosystem necessary to the very survival of so many species of wildlife.</p> <p>Start by actually addressing the continuing issues we face with climate change. This is not one of them.</p> | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p> |
| 2189 | 1 | <p>Don't mess with our Delta! It is a valuable resource on which the whole Bay ecosystem depends. Altering the water flow will endanger the plant, fish and bird, and [other] animal life that depends on it, as well as harming adjacent farmers.</p> <p>Building the tunnels is an enormously expensive project that will accomplish little other than diverting the water flow to benefit some water users at the expense of others. It does nothing to create new water sources, nor to more wisely manage the limited ones we have.</p> | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> |
| 2190 | 1 | <p>I am writing in opposition to the "California WaterFix."</p> <p>It seems to me that Southern California has been trying to suck away Northern California's water since before I was born -- and I'm 75.</p> <p>I'm not able to drive as far as the Delta any more, but I've seen it many times. It's a beautiful and complex ecosystem that depends totally on the water from the Sacramento River. The tunnel project will divert water from that entire estuary, just as climate change will be lowering the flow by reducing the snowpack. We've had a</p> | <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | <p>preview of those conditions during our prolonged drought.</p> <p>For the sake of the habitat and the local economy, please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.</p> | <p>Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> |
| 2192 | 1 | <p>Californians need to learn how to conserve water. We must not destroy the state's principal ecological systems in order to prevent golf courses and palatial residence grounds from turning brown. Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta as well as give us enough water to bathe, cook and drink.</p> | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Uses), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p> |
| 2193 | 1 | <p>Hands off the Delta; just say no to big agriculture's diabolical water rip-off tunnels! Please do not approve the disastrous plan to change California's perfectly designed natural water system. You must not allow them to drain the Delta, now or ever.</p> | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> |
| 2194 | 1 | <p>Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta while recognizing the more sustainable approaches of more local water catchment and aquifer replenishment.</p> | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|--|
| | | | <p>Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.</p> |
| 2195 | 1 | Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta. We could save 25% of our drinking water if people used composting toilets but nobody is suggesting this as an option. Why? | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> |
| 2196 | 1 | We have a drought in Northern California. They have plenty of water in the south. Please leave what little water we have left in Northern California. Perhaps the south could send some to the farmlands in Central California. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> |
| 2197 | 1 | Stop it! Quit trying to destroy the Delta and San Francisco Bay! This is not the answer, sacrificing the Bay and Delta, for Southern California's water problems. Permanent destruction of a priceless resource and habitat for overbuilt desert communities that continue to expand. Only in Superman's Bizarro World does that make any kind of sense. Why not put water storage under every downspout in Los Angeles? That's what we are doing here in Hayward, California. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> |

| RECIRCLtr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|------------|------|--|---|
| | | | <p>Appendix 1C Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California’s water resources.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p> |
| 2198 | 1 | We have to look at the big picture for our beloved California! Not short-term fixes. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> |
| 2199 | 1 | How about not forcing water uphill [through] Tejon Pass and have them make it in Southern California? Better use of resources. | <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> |